

**103<sup>rd</sup> District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting**  
**Springfield Township Building**  
**9150 Winton Road**  
**Cincinnati, OH 45231**  
**May 5, 2006 – 9:00 a.m.**

## **AGENDA**

- 1) Meeting called to order – Chairman Brayshaw
- 2) Introductions: Ron Roberts, newly appointed alternate member for Richard Huddleston; Bryan Williams from the City of Cincinnati to the SCIP/LTIP Support Staff.
- 3) Approval of 102<sup>nd</sup> District #2 Integrating Committee meeting minutes from December 9, 2005.
- 4) District Liaison Items:
  - (A) Ohio Job Ready Sites Program (JRS) Update
  - (B) Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund (Brownfield) Update
  - (C) Clean Ohio Conservation Fund (Greenspace) Update – HB 530
  - (D) Appointment of NRAC nominee to finish the term of Terry Hankner set to expire on October 11, 2007. *(Vote Required)\*\**
- 5) SCIP/LTIP Support Staff Items:
  - (A) Support Staff Guidelines *(See Attached)*
  - (B) Economic Health Ratings update *(See Attached)*
  - (C) Proposed “Additional Support Information” *(Vote Required)\*\**
  - (D) Proposed “Round 21 Rating Methodology” – includes “Project Selection Criteria”, “Handbook”, and “Schedule” *(See Attached) (Vote Required)\*\**
- 6) Small Governments Sub-Committee:

The Small Government Commission will hold a vote on the submitted projects on May 10, 2006. The District Liaison will be in attendance at the meeting.
- 7) Old Business:
- 8) New Business: Set deadline date for nominations of four NRAC seats that expire October 11, 2006. Suggested deadline date of Friday, June 30, 2006 – 4:00 PM. The Nominating Sub-Committee will have final nominations ready for a vote on August 18, 2006.
- 9) Next Meeting Date: Friday, August 18, 2006 – 9:00 am to set the priority listing of the Job Ready Sites Program projects and appoint four NRAC members.
- 10) Meeting Adjourn.

**\*\*Note:** Seven (7) affirmative votes are required to approve any item on the agenda.

### **Website Addresses:**

[www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/SCIP/ltip.htm](http://www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/SCIP/ltip.htm)  
[www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/nrac.htm](http://www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/nrac.htm)  
[www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/clean\\_ohio\\_revitalization\\_fund.htm](http://www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/clean_ohio_revitalization_fund.htm)  
[www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/job\\_ready\\_sites\\_program.htm](http://www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/job_ready_sites_program.htm)

103<sup>rd</sup> District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting

Springfield Township Building  
Allen Paul Room  
9150 Winton Road  
Cincinnati, OH 45231

9:00 a.m.

May 5, 2006

BOARD ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Wm. Branshaw	HCE	946-8902
Joe Sykes	HCTA	941-3393
Eden Enclumet	Capt. Enclumet	352-6232
Scott Stiles	City of Cincinnati	352-5373
DAVE SAVAGE	HCML (Wyoming)	821-7600
TOM BRYAN	HCTA	522-1410
Richard D. Doolittle	H.C.	383-8282 ✓
Steve Barley	City of Cincinnati	352-5484
Doug Brooks/g	HCML (NCH)	

103<sup>rd</sup> District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting

Springfield Township Building  
Allen Paul Room  
9150 Winton Road  
Cincinnati, OH 45231

9:00 a.m.

May 5, 2006

VISITOR LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Cathy Listermann	HCE	946-8902
Joe Cottrill	HCE	946-8906
GREG LONG	CITY OF CINCINNATI	352 5289
Bryan Williams	City of Cincinnati	352-4506
Bill Shefcik	City of Cincinnati	352-5273
Bob Bass	Delhi	922-8609
JOHN BECK	HCE	946-4267
Wendy Hulbrand	HCE	946-8903
DICK CLINE	CITY OF CINTI.	352-6235
Michael Miller	OPWC	614-734-1004
DOUG RINDLOUCH	HCE	946-4277
JA C Kf	NCH	521-7413

City of Blue Ash

# 102<sup>nd</sup> District #2 Integrating Committee

December 9, 2005 – 1:30 p.m.

Springfield Township  
Allan Paul Room  
9150 Winton Road  
Cincinnati, OH 45231

Chairman Brayshaw called the 102<sup>nd</sup> District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

**Board Members Present:** Chairman – William Brayshaw, Board Member – Dan Brooks, Board Member – Tom Bryan, Board Member – Eileen Enabnit, Board Member – Richard Huddleston, Board Member – Bill Moller, Board Member – David Savage, Board Member – Scott Stiles and Vice-Chairman – Joseph Sykes

**Alternate Members Present:** Alternate Member – Ted Hubbard; Alternate Member – Rob Molloy; Alternate Member – Don Rosemeyer; Alternate Member – Stephanie Stoller

**Support Staff & Guest Present:** Hamilton County – Mr. Joe Cottrill, Pat Ashcraft, John Beck, Eric Beck and Mr. Doug Riddiough; City of Cincinnati – Mr. Greg Long, Mr. Dick Cline, Mr. Richard Szekeresh, Mr. Bill Schefcik, Mr. Joe Vogel, Mr. Steve Bailey, Mr. Steve Niemeier; Greater Cincinnati Water Works – Ms. Becky Calder, Mr. Ken Culpin and Mr. Brian Pickering; Village of Lockland – Mr. David Krings; Lincoln Heights Community Improvement Corporation – Mr. Al Kaners; Woolpert – Mr. Mike Battles and Mike Elderbrock; City of Loveland – Mr. Chad Ingle; City of Madeira – Mr. Tom Moller; City of Blue Ash – Mr. Richard Dole; City of Mt. Healthy – Mr. Bill Kocher; OPWC – Mr. Mike Miller; Hamilton County Park District – Mr. Jack Sutton; City of North College Hill – Mr. John Knuf; Springfield Township – Mr. Chris Gilbert; Colerain Township – Mr. Tim Lang; CDS – Mr. David Emerick; Citizens for Civic Renewal – Mr. Steve Johns; City of Silverton – Mr. John Smith, Mr. Mark Wendling, Ms. Joyce Glover and Ms. Shirley Hackett

## Acknowledgement

Chairman Brayshaw shared that Alternate Member Dave Wagner had recently passed away, acknowledging further all of his good work while serving on the District #2 Integrating Committee, as well as working as a member of the Ohio Public Works Commission and also serving as the Chair for several years.

## Approval of Minutes:

*Board Member Savage moved for the approval of the minutes from the 101<sup>st</sup> District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting dated September 9, 2005; seconded by Board Member Huddleston and the motion carried unanimously.*

## NRAC Committee Report:

◇ Mr. Jack Sutton, Chairman of the District #2 NRAC provided a brief update to the Integrating Committee regarding the following items: *(Copy of Report Distributed)*

### ○ **Current Members Serving on the NRAC Committee:**

Jack Sutton – Hamilton County Park District  
Holly Utrata-Halcomb – Hamilton County Soil & Water  
Jim Garges – Cincinnati Recreation Commission  
Paul Beck – Miami Township  
Ray Hodges – City of Forest Park  
Ron Miller – Hamilton County Regional Planning

Willie Carden, Jr. – Cincinnati Park Board  
David Savage – City of Wyoming  
Eric Russo – Hillside Trust  
Terry Hankner – Ohio Assoc. of Realtors  
Ken Grob – Hamilton County Farm Bureau

○ Three meetings were held this year, along with the NRAC Annual Meeting held in November 2005.

- ***Current Slate of Elected Officers:***
  - Jack Sutton – Chairman
  - Holly Utrata-Halcomb – Vice-Chairman
  - Jim Garges – Secretary
- ***Major Accomplishments:***
  - Revision of the Scoring Criteria & Scoring Methodology
  - 4<sup>th</sup> and Final Round of Funding Unless Reauthorized Next Year
  - Funding should be Available in the Spring of 2006
  - Scheduled an Application Deadline of Friday, March 31, 2006
  - Funding for the District #2 NRAC is Approximately \$2.26 Million Per Round
- Report Summarizing Round #1, Round #2 and Round #3 Projects (*Copy of Report Distributed*)
- ***Overview of the NRAC Program:***
  - Three funding rounds represent almost 800 acres of property in Hamilton County that is being protected as green space; much of it being new acquisitions. A portion of it is also restoring or claiming existing properties.
- ◇ Chairman Brayshaw thanked Mr. Sutton and the NRAC Committee for doing an excellent job. Mr. Sutton also shared that the NRAC Committee is very thankful for all the help that Mr. Joe Cottrill, District Liaison Officer has provided to him and to the members of the NRAC.

#### **District Liaison Items:**

##### **◇ OPWC History Report:**

- Mr. Joe Cottrill provided a brief report regarding OPWC funding in District #2. The report provides funding data in Hamilton County for Rounds #1-#10 and Rounds #11-#19. (*Copy of Report Distributed*)

##### **◇ Brownfield Clean Ohio Revitalization Program Update:**

- Mr. Cottrill stated the Clean Ohio Council would vote on December 14, 2005, as to which Brownfield projects would be funded by the Clean Ohio Revitalization Program. Mr. Cottrill stated that he would follow up by e-mail to all of the District #2 Integrating Committee members with the final results as to where Hamilton County ranked statewide.

##### **◇ Integrating Committee Regulations:**

- Mr. Cottrill provided the following information with regards to the Ohio Revised Code - Chapter 164:

##### **1.) Make-up of the Integrating Committee**

Due to this being the meeting where funding requests are finalized, there may be those here who are not familiar with the make-up of the Integrating Committee, or its function. As outlined in Chapter 164.04(A)(2) of the Ohio Revised Code, the make-up of the District 2 Integrating Committee is as follows:

“In district two, the district committee shall consist of nine members appointed as follows: two shall be appointed by the board of county commissioners; three shall be appointed by the chief executive officer of the most populous municipal corporation in the district; two shall be appointed by a majority of the other chief executive officers of municipal corporations in the district; and two shall be appointed by a majority of the boards of township trustees in the district”.

It further states that: “The affirmative vote of at least seven members of the committee is required for any action taken by a vote of the committee”.

Also, Chapter 164.04(D) states that: “Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, a county, municipal, or township public official may serve as a member of a district public works integrating committee”.

## 2.) Role of the Integrating Committee

Your role as outlined in Chapter 164.06 of the Ohio Revised Code is to evaluate the applications submitted by governmental jurisdictions for which assistance is sought from the state capital improvements fund, and to select the requests for financial assistance that will be formally submitted by the district to the director of the Ohio Public Works Commission.

District 2 has written a rating methodology for this round of funding, and the Director of the OPWC has approved it, as per the Ohio Revised Code. The Support Staff is presenting to you a funding proposal based on that rating methodology. The Support Staff will present you with a proposed “Priority Listing” of projects, rated from the highest scoring project to the lowest. It will be up to you as a committee to agree on that priority listing order. All of the funding scenarios are based on the proposed priority listing. I would also emphasize that District 2 does not have a rating methodology that allows “discretionary points” to be added to the score of any project submitted for funding.

## 3.) Conflict of Interest

Chapter 164.04(E) states as follows: A member of a district committee does not have an unlawful interest in a public contract under section 2921.42 of the Revised Code solely by virtue of the receipt of financial assistance under this chapter by the local subdivision of which he is also a public official or appointee.

## City of Cincinnati Requesting to Address the Integrating Committee

- ◇ Mr. Cottrill informed the Integrating Committee of a letter from the City of Cincinnati requesting to address the Integrating Committee with regards to Round 20 SCIP / LTIP Appeals. *(Copy of Letter Attached)*

Board Member Enabnit stated the City of Cincinnati is willing to waive their request to address the Integrating Committee and to also waive their appeal as submitted. Furthermore, requesting to bring something up to the board for them to think about and to discuss. Stating further that she thought there were some changes in the process that the Support Staff used this round. It was suggested that at a future meeting it would be good to have members of the Support Staff come and talk to the Integrating Committee about what the changes were and how the process went and where they would like to go in the next round. It was felt that it would be good if the members were engaged in these discussions, especially since the Integrating Committee places a great deal of confidence in their recommendations.

Board Member Enabnit stated the City of Cincinnati would be dropping their appeal at this time, expressing that she would like to make this a future agenda item to start having discussions if it is agreeable to everyone else.

Chairman Brayshaw stated it was a good idea to have a briefing by the Support Staff at least annually and prior to the new round of funding. It was felt there had been some tweaking and improvements in the process that not everybody is up to date on.

*Board Member Enabnit moved to have an item listed on the agenda for future Integrating Committee meetings in order for the Support Staff to be able to brief the Integrating Committee members about decisions and processes that have taken place prior to the new round of funding; seconded by Chairman Brayshaw and the motion carried unanimously.*

Chairman Brayshaw stated that we would need to get some input from the Support Staff as to when this would be appropriate before going too far into Round 21. Mr. Cottrill noted that the Support Staff would probably meet during the end of January or beginning of February 2006.

Board Member Bryan asked if it would be worthwhile if there would be any particular questions entertained by the board to submit them so the Support Staff could have time to review what questions would be out there. Mr. Cottrill suggested that questions be e-mailed to him directly.

Board Member Enabnit asked if there was capacity to have a working session with the Support Staff. Mr. Cottrill relayed that the Support Staff could accommodate this at anytime. Board Member Enabnit stated that something a little more formal where everyone is sitting at the table for discussion.

Board Member Huddleston stated this has been done after the fact, after the Support Staff has summarized everything. The point is well made and if a special meeting is needed earlier in the year that would be fine. Also, with reference to Board Member Bryan's point, that we are not only members of this committee, but members of municipalities and jurisdictions should also submit those questions.

Board Member Enabnit stated that the Integrating Committee as a group kind of have some ownership in the process and feel real comfortable with what is going on while the Support Staff is doing all the hard work.

Board Member Bryan noted the Support Staff made some clarifications last year, just in the rating sheet itself so that we were not flipping from one book to another book to find out if things carried through correctly.

Chairman Brayshaw stated that it is especially important now that we have another ten years to look at, which is to be celebrated as well.

It was further requested of Mr. Cottrill to follow-up with a letter to all the jurisdictions regarding any questions they may have about the District #2 Integrating Committee (i.e., Rating Methodology, Rating Review and procedures of the Support Staff). *(Letter was sent to all Hamilton County Jurisdictions on January 10, 2006)*

### **Support Staff Items:**

#### **◇ Results of Appeals and Final Scores for SCIP/LTIP Projects:**

Mr. Cottrill provided the official results of the (18) projects that were appealed. Noting that if an item was appealed there would be a black X or number on the spreadsheet to indicate the new rating. If there is a black X then this was an appeal that was made, but the appeal was denied. Some jurisdictions had more than one appeal. These appeals were reflected within the final scores for both the SCIP/LTIP rating systems. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

#### **◇ Program Year 2006 - Round 20 Budget and Breakdown:**

Mr. Cottrill provided a complete explanation of Program Year 2006 – Round #20 budget breakdown. *(Copies of Handout were Distributed)*

The Support Staff recommended the following items:

- Total funds available for SCIP - \$ 9,989,290
- Total funds available for LTIP - \$ 5,122,474
- Total funds proposed for SCIP - \$11,833,813



- Total funds proposed for LTIP - \$ 6,086,048
- Total SCIP Grants - \$7,719,889
- Total LTIP Grants - \$6,086,048
- Total SCIP Loan/Loan Assistance - \$1,997,800
- Total Revolving Loan Program - \$2,116,124
- Total Loans/Loan Assistance - \$4,113,924
- Total SCIP Available Proposed Remaining Balance: (\$1,844,523)
- Total LTIP Available Proposed Remaining Balance: (\$ 963,574)
- Total Small Government Projects: \$3,786,520

◇ **Recommended Priority Listing (SCIP & LTIP) – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided a very thorough explanation and overview of the priority listings for both SCIP and LTIP. It was further explained that the vote would be taken on the priority order of projects #1 through #66. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

After further discussion, the following motion was made:

*Board Member Savage moved adoption of the priority listings as presented by the Support Staff for both SCIP & LTIP projects (Projects #1 - #66) for the District #2 Integrating Committee for Round #20; seconded by Board Member Brooks and the motion carried unanimously.*

◇ **Recommended Grant Projects (SCIP & LTIP) – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided a very thorough explanation and overview of the recommended grant projects for both SCIP and LTIP. It was further explained that the vote would be taken on the priority of projects #1 through #12 for SCIP and the priority of projects #1 through #5 for LTIP. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

After further discussion, the following motion was made:

*Board Member Brooks moved adoption of the SCIP & LTIP Grant Projects as presented by the Support Staff for the District #2 Integrating Committee for Round #20; seconded by Board Member Savage and the motion carried unanimously.*

◇ **Recommended Loan Projects (SCIP Allocation & Revolving Loan Program) – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided the recommended SCIP Allocation Loan and Revolving Loan Program Projects. Noting the previously approved priority for projects #26, #31 #41 for the SCIP Allocation and projects #15 and #44 under the Revolving Loan Program. It was further noted that a correction should be made to the spreadsheet entitled “*SCIP Allocation Loan Project*” under Project #31 for the City of Cincinnati (CWW R20-001-5B - Countywide Water Main Improvements) there is no interest rate for term and the field should be left blank. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

*Board Member Huddleston moved adoption of the SCIP Allocation Projects and the Revolving Loan Projects as presented by the Support Staff for the District #2 Integrating Committee for Round #20; seconded by Board Member Sykes and the motion carried unanimously.*

Board Member Savage noted the District #2 Integrating Committee had approved 22 projects in total for various kinds of funding. Of those 22 projects, 16 of them represent different jurisdictions. Noting further that the District #2 Integrating Committee had a long-term goal of striving for a system that would make sure that each jurisdiction that had a true need would have a reasonable opportunity to compete for these funds.

Board Member Brooks referenced the informative twenty-year past history report provided by the Support Staff and complimented them, as well as the District #2 Integrating Committee for all their hard work over the years. Further noting \$321 million dollars total funding. Stating that he would like to know if these projects have other benefits to their communities that have been effective. Inquiring further to find out a quantitative check to see that if in a main corridor, has it improved the economic welfare of the community and has it improved the housing stock? What other benefits have resulted from this funding? It was felt there is more to building great roads, sewers and sidewalks and \$321 million dollars of infrastructure.

Board Member Savage stated there is an Urban Design program at the University of Cincinnati, noting this as an excellent research project.

Board Member Huddleston also stated this information would be interesting if taken to the legislature with other types of programs that could be funded in a similar manner. You could then get the spin off of whether it is housing or urban center renewals for the various jurisdictions.

After further discussion, Mr. Cottrill stated that he would see what the Support Staff could come up with.

◇ **Useful Life Update:**

Mr. Cottrill provided an informational overview of the Useful Life for the SCIP, LTIP and RLP programs. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

Mr. Cottrill noted the SCIP projects along with the assistance of the allocation loans, has a useful life of a little over twenty-seven years. The minimum is twenty-years. The LTIP projects have a useful life of a little over twenty-three years. The RLP, which must have it's own separate useful life has a useful life of approximately thirty-seven years.

Chairman Brayshaw shared the following comments, noting that the coordination of utility cuts with the OPWC projects need to be emphasized to a greater degree. Stating further that he personally hates to sign a document that says it has a useful life of twenty-years and then three years later a MSD project comes in that wants an open cut twenty feet deep through the road. This will interfere with traffic again, with the businesses again and also with Safety Services again. There is the need to have an in depth review of MSD's capital improvement program with respect to underground utilities that are proposed to be improved in the foreseeable future, within at least twenty-years. Then to look at alternatives of not going through the pavement if they can't get it done within the timeframe of the OPWC projects so they can be done concurrent. Looking at the next ten years this coordination work should be emphasized between the utilities as well as anything where there is going to be open cuts in the right-of-way needed. It was strongly suggested that this should be a future goal of the District #2 Integrating Committee.

Board Member Bryan stated this should be addressed with MSD and the CWW, noting the need to have a twenty-year projection. This is not only directly affecting the projects; it is also a perceptual thing with the taxpayers.

Board Member Moller stated from the City of Cincinnati's perspective, they see project lists or capital budgets that come in from MSD and CWW in July for the next two years. By the time the budgets are actually approved, there are changes between summer and fall based on their ability to get other funding and on other priorities. One of the biggest problems is that it is the constant change and it is very difficult to coordinate all that goes on. Both MSD and CWW have multi-year capital plans that should be shared with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office, at least for those projects that are anticipated in Hamilton County, if not in other jurisdictions. The list would change, but at least you would be made aware of the lists.

Board Member Stiles also added that he had just sat in on a series of presentations by all of the divisions of MSD and one of their Division Superintendents mentioned the exact points noted in discussion here today. Specifically internally with the City of Cincinnati, in terms of coordinating with other departments, they spoke about the Department of Transportation & Engineering and CWW.

Chairman Brayshaw stated there is a need for advanced planning coordination. As the problem with OPWC projects is that we don't know until a meeting like this what is going to get funded. So we don't realize in advance what projects will get funded. At this point in time, now that we have voted, we should definitely circulate and coordinate again, so that the utilities know what the Integrating Committee approved and about what timeframe construction is anticipated.

Board Member Bryan stated that rather than all of the different municipalities and townships that are chasing after Cinergy, MSD and CWW, it was suggested to have the Hamilton County Engineer's Office serve as a clearinghouse for those projects. He noted that not only do the townships have township roads; they have county roads that crisscross throughout townships and cities.

Chairman Brayshaw stated, as County Engineer for all of the Townships, this could be done, but all the other municipalities may not agree. Most of this coordination would have to come from MSD, CWW and the City of Cincinnati Engineering Department. The only others would be if they have independent waterworks such as the City of Wyoming, City of Loveland and City of Harrison. As an example, the County Engineer's Office has been working very closely with Harrison Township and the City of Harrison with the Dry Fork Road project. But this type of work needs to be done across the board. It was also noted that in the past there were utility coordination meetings and then the utilities stopped attending. Now Cinergy wants to be reimbursed for everything that is moved, even though it was in county right-of-way.

◇ **Recommended Small Government Projects – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided an informational overview of the (5) recommended Small Governments Projects. *(Copies of Spreadsheets were Distributed)*

*Board Member Bryan moved adoption of the top (5) Small Government Projects priority listing as presented to the Board for the District #2 Integrating Committee for Round #20; seconded by Board Member Stiles and the motion carried unanimously.*

◇ **Recommended District Administrative Costs Program for 2006 – Vote Required:**

Mr. Cottrill provided an informational overview of the recommended District Administrative Costs Program for 2006. *(Copies of Handout were Distributed)*

*Board Member Moller moved adoption of the recommended District Administrative Costs for the total amount of Forty Thousand Dollars for Program Year 2006 for the District #2 Integrating Committee; seconded by Board Member Sykes and the motion carried unanimously.*

Board Member Moller thanked the District #2 Integrating Committee Support Staff and Mr. Cottrill for all their hard work over the past twenty years.

**Small Government Sub-Committee:**

- ◇ Board Member Bryan announced that the Small Government Sub-Committee would be meeting in May of 2006.

**Old Business:**

- ◇ Mr. Mike Miller, OPWC Representative, provided a brief update regarding Issue One:

The Senate introduced Senate Bill 263 last Friday. There were hearings and they voted the bill out of committee on Tuesday. It was then voted out of the whole Senate unanimously on Wednesday. It is believed that the House has the intention of picking that bill up and have hearings and vote it out of committee early next week and then vote it out of the whole house mid next week. The bills bonds are by Senator John Kerry, who has the implementing language for the Third Frontier Program as well as the Job Ready Site Development Program. The current language that passed out of the Senate follows the Brownfield Revitalization Program delivery model. It will be asking the (19) District Integrating Committee's to accept applications and prioritize them locally and forward three applications to the Ohio Department of Development where they will be in a statewide competition. Then the final project selection process will take place at the Ohio Department of Development. They are looking to rely on the District Integrating Committee's similar to the Brownfield Revitalization Program to get some local prioritization and flavor into that project selection process.

In addition, the newly enacted section constitution (2P) allows for bonds to be issued once per fiscal year under that program for calendar 2006. Their intention is to touch two fiscal years for two \$30 million dollar funding rounds in calendar year 2006. Noting that if anyone has projects they think may fit into that program it was suggested to look at the implementing legislation.

Chairman Brayshaw thanked Mr. Miller for the update.

#### **New Business:**

- ◇ Mr. Cottrill announced that all District #2 Integrating Committee Board Members and Alternate Members must be reappointed or replaced by May 2006. Letters of appointment from the appropriate jurisdiction / organization are due to the District Liaison prior to Monday, May 1, 2006. These appointments are done every three years.

#### **Next Meeting Date:**

- ◇ Next District #2 Integrating Committee meeting date is to be determined. It was further noted that a letter would be submitted to all committee members and jurisdictions inviting them to submit questions for the Support Staff. Once this information is compiled a meeting date will be determined.
- ◇ Board Member Savage shared that a future meeting might also be needed in order to follow-up on the new legislative and Brownfield information as reported earlier.

#### **Adjournment:**

*Board Member Savaged moved to adjourn the 102<sup>nd</sup> District #2 Integrating Committee meeting; seconded by Board Member Bryan and the meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

*Cathy Listermann*  
Cathy Listermann  
Recording Secretary

# DISTRICT 2 BREAKDOWN - PY 2006 - ROUND 20

## FUNDS AVAILABLE

	<u>SCIP</u>	<u>LTIP</u>
TRICT GRANT ALLOCATION	\$6,196,000.00	\$5,089,000.00
EXISTING BALANCE	\$371,434.00	\$33,474.00
MAXIMUM TOTAL GRANTS =	\$6,567,434.00	\$5,122,474.00
REGULAR ALLOCATION LOANS	\$1,549,000.00	
ADDITIONAL ALLOCATION LOANS	\$0.00	
MINIMUM TOTAL LOANS =	\$1,549,000.00	
REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM	\$1,539,000.00	
ADDITIONAL RLP FUNDS	\$333,856.00	
TOTAL RLP FUNDS =	\$1,872,856.00	
<b>TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE =</b>	<b>\$9,989,290.00</b>	<b>\$5,122,474.00</b>

## FUNDS PROPOSED

	<u>SCIP</u>	<u>LTIP</u>
PROPOSED GRANT TOTALS	\$7,719,889.00	\$6,086,048.00
SCIP LOAN / LOAN ASSISTANCE TOTAL	\$1,997,800.00	\$0.00
RLP LOAN TOTAL	\$2,116,124.00	\$0.00
PROPOSED TOTALS	\$11,833,813.00	\$6,086,048.00
<b>AVAILABLE</b>	<b>\$9,989,290.00</b>	<b>\$5,122,474.00</b>
<b>PROPOSED</b>	<b>\$11,833,813.00</b>	<b>\$6,086,048.00</b>
REMAINING BALANCE	(\$1,844,523.00)	(\$963,574.00)

## PROGRAM YEAR 2006 PROJECTS

### SCIP GRANT PROJECTS

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	TYPE	RECOMMEND	COMMENTS
D2IC-R20-002-00	\$28,000.00		GRANT	SCIP	DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS
CMB R20-001-2A	\$425,000.00	1	GRANT	SCIP	
DEL R20-001-2C	\$400,000.00	2	GRANT	SCIP	
NOR R20-001-2C	\$1,320,000.00	3	GRANT	SCIP	
CHE R20-002-2A	\$218,400.00	4	GRANT	SCIP	
CIN R20-002-2A	\$750,000.00	5	GRANT	SCIP	
NCH R20-001-2C	\$480,000.00	6	GRANT	SCIP	
SPR R20-001-2B	\$367,600.00	7	GRANT	SCIP	
COL R20-001-2C, 1A	\$828,000.00	8	GRANT	SCIP	
GRN R20-002-2A	\$152,020.00	9	GRANT	SCIP	
STB R20-001-2B	\$600,000.00	10	GRANT	SCIP	
CIN R20-001-2A	\$840,000.00	11	GRANT	SCIP	PARTIALLY FUNDED
GLE R20-001-1B	\$257,600.00	12	CONTINGENCY	SCIP	
LOV R20-001-2C	\$363,429.00	13	CONTINGENCY	SCIP	
NBD R20-001-2C	\$129,840.00	14	CONTINGENCY	SCIP	
NCH R20-003-2C	\$560,000.00	15	CONTINGENCY	SCIP	
<b>SCIP GRANT TOTAL =</b>	<b>\$7,719,889.00</b>				
<b>SCIP LOAN/LOAN ASSISTANCE TOTAL =</b>	<b>\$1,997,800.00</b>				
<b>TOTAL SCIP RECOMMENDATIONS =</b>	<b>\$9,717,689.00</b>	<b>=</b>	<b>125.4705%</b>	<b>OF ALLOCATION</b>	<b>(MINIMUM = 115%)</b>

### SCIP ALLOCATION LOANS / LOAN ASSISTANCE

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	PROJECT TYPE	RECOMMEND	INTEREST RATE	TERM YEARS
SIL R20-001-2A	\$525,000.00	26	LOAN	SCIP	0%	20
CWW R20-01-5B	\$950,000.00	31	LOAN ASSISTANCE	SCIP	N/A	N/A
LOV R20-003-5B	\$522,800.00	41	LOAN	SCIP	0%	20
<b>SCIP LOAN / L.A. TOTAL (ALLOCATION) =</b>		<b>\$1,997,800.00</b>	<b>=</b>	<b>25.7947%</b>	<b>OF ALLOCATION</b>	<b>(MINIMUM = 20%)</b>

### REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	PROJECT TYPE	RECOMMEND	INTEREST RATE	TERM YEARS
HAM R20-002-2A	\$1,552,500.00	15	LOAN	RLP	0%	20
MSD R20-01-4A	\$563,624.00	44	LOAN	RLP	0%	20
<b>REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM TOTAL=</b>		<b>\$2,116,124.00</b>				
<b>TOTAL ALL LOANS/LOAN ASSISTANCE =</b>		<b>\$4,113,924.00</b>				

### LTIP GRANT PROJECTS

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	TYPE	RECOMMEND	COMMENTS
D2IC-R20-002-00	\$12,000.00		GRANT	LTIP	DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS
FAX R20-001-2D	\$1,802,150.00	1	GRANT	LTIP	2nd HALF OF FUNDS
GRN R20-001-2D	\$1,151,228.00	2	GRANT	LTIP	SAME AMOUNT IN ROUND 21
HAM R20-001-2A	\$876,000.00	3	GRANT	LTIP	SAME AMOUNT IN ROUND 21
SHA R20-001-2D	\$814,670.00	4	GRANT	LTIP	
CIN R20-003-2A	\$590,000.00	5	GRANT	LTIP	PARTIALLY FUNDED
CIN R20-001-2A	\$840,000.00	6	CONTINGENCY	LTIP	
<b>LTIP GRANT TOTAL =</b>		<b>\$6,086,048.00</b>	<b>=</b>	<b>119.5922%</b>	<b>OF ALLOCATION (MINIMUM = 115%)</b>

### SMALL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS

PROJECT CODE	\$ REQUEST	PROJ. NO.	TYPE	ORDER RECOMMENDED	COMMENTS
GLE R20-001-1B	\$257,600.00	13	SMALL GOVERNMENT	1	5 ADDITIONAL POINTS
NBD R20-001-2C	\$129,840.00	16	SMALL GOVERNMENT	2	4 ADDITIONAL POINTS
LOC R20-001-2A	\$495,000.00	32	SMALL GOVERNMENT	3	3 ADDITIONAL POINTS
NEW R20-001-2A	\$224,000.00	48	SMALL GOVERNMENT	4	2 ADDITIONAL POINTS
ADD R20-001-22A	\$452,900.00	38	SMALL GOVERNMENT	5	1 ADDITIONAL POINT
MAR R20-001-2,3A	\$345,000.00	55	SMALL GOVERNMENT	6	
CLE R20-001-2D	\$900,000.00	51	SMALL GOVERNMENT	7	
NBD R20-002-2A	\$172,000.00	60	SMALL GOVERNMENT	8	
WDL R20-001-2D	\$492,000.00	47	SMALL GOVERNMENT	9	
GLE R20-002-2A	\$318,180.00	39	SMALL GOVERNMENT	10	

**TOTAL SMALL GOVERNMENT REQUEST = \$3,786,520.00**

(MAXIMUM OF 10 APPLICATIONS MAY BE SUBMITTED TO THE SMALL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION)

# **DISTRICT 2 SUPPORT STAFF GUIDELINES**

## **I. SUPPORT STAFF/RATING TEAM SELECTION**

### **A. CURRENT SUPPORT STAFF STRUCTURE**

- 1) Eleven members (all with voting authority for consensus)
  - a. Five – Two member rating teams
  - b. One – District Liaison
  - c. Two – Technical Assistants
- 2) Appointed by
  - a. City of Cincinnati – four members
  - b. Hamilton County – four members
  - c. Municipal League – one member
  - d. Township Association – two members
- 3) Terms are indefinite
- 4) Reimbursement (\$40,000 per fiscal year)
  - a. Cincinnati (\$14,000)
  - b. Hamilton County (\$20,000)
  - c. North College Hill (\$1,500)
  - d. Sycamore Township (\$1,500)
  - e. Delhi Township (\$3,000)

### **B. CURRENT RATING TEAM STRUCTURE**

- 1) The District Liaison assigns new rating teams or they may remain the same as the previous year.

## **II. APPLICATION REVIEW**

### **A. CURRENT METHOD**

- 1) GENERAL
  - a. Applications are reviewed for completeness by the District Liaison and several members of the Support Staff one week prior to the application deadline for each round.
  - b. The group completes a “completeness checklist” to ensure all applications submitted at the pre-submission deadline are reviewed thoroughly.
  - c. The District Liaison notifies a jurisdiction whose applications are incomplete, providing an additional three business days from the date of the notification to provide missing materials.
  - d. The Support Staff and District Liaison cannot be held responsible for identifying omissions in applications even if filed early. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide all necessary materials and project information prior to the deadline, with the review provided by the District Liaison only a courtesy.

### **III. PROJECT DISTRIBUTION**

#### **A. CURRENT METHOD**

- 1) The District Liaison and Technical Assistants sort projects for distribution based on the following (in order of importance):
  - a. Expertise of the Rating Team
  - b. Project type (Roadway rehabilitation, Roadway Expansion, Structural, Drainage, etc.)
  - c. Location
  - d. Balanced number of projects rated per team
- 2) All rating teams are able to call upon another team's expertise if needed.
- 3) No member can be involved in rating a project from their own jurisdiction.

### **IV. PROJECT RATING**

#### **A. CURRENT METHOD**

##### **1) GENERAL**

- a. In all cases, it is the intent of the Support Staff to build a consensus position in all facets of the district's program. However, from time to time, consensus cannot be reached. When consensus is not reached, the following may happen:
  1. If a vote of the Support Staff is taken, and the minority feels strongly enough about its position, the minority can file a minority report for the Integrating Committee's consideration.
  2. If a vote is taken and the result is a deadlock, both sides can file a report for the Integrating Committee's consideration.
- b. In all cases, the decision of the Integrating Committee is final.

##### **2) PRE-APPLICATION PROJECTS**

- a. An applicant may request that the condition (only) of a Project be pre-rated so that maintenance work can be performed on the infrastructure.
- b. The project must then be applied for in the subsequent round.
- c. The District Liaison assigns the project to two separate rating teams (one for the actual rating, the other in case of an appeal).
- d. Once the rating is complete, the District Liaison informs the jurisdiction that they can proceed with their scheduled maintenance.
- e. The rating is kept confidential until it is paired with the actual project rating team.

##### **3) PROJECT FIELD RATING**

- a. Each rating team field checks and verifies all application information. Ratings are assigned in the field.
- b. No Support Staff member can be involved in rating a project from their own jurisdiction (member may be in attendance but is not involved in the field rating process).
- c. A rating team may call upon another team's expertise as required.



**4) PROJECT RATING MEETING**

- a. The District Liaison presides over the meeting of the Support Staff and drafts a list of the order in which projects are to be discussed.
- b. Each Rating Team presents the project it has rated, without multipliers, for consensus by the entire Support Staff.
  1. If consensus is not reached, a vote is called for by the District Liaison and majority rules (For details, see 4A.1 – General.
  2. No Support Staff member can be involved in rating a project from their own jurisdiction (member may be in attendance but cannot speak about the merits of the project during the rating process).
- c. After all projects are discussed and a consensus on the project rating has been reached, the District Liaison assigns the multipliers to the point system and the projects are ranked (for the first time) on the basis of total score (tie breakers are also placed in effect).
- d. The District Liaison sends the ratings awarded (without the multipliers) on each jurisdiction's projects to that agency with an offer to appeal any rating that the jurisdiction disagrees with.

**5) FIELD APPEAL RATING**

- a. A field rating is performed on the appealed project in the same manner prescribed above for Project Field Rating with the following exceptions:
  1. A different rating team reviews the appeal in the field (thus giving the project a new set of eyes).
    - a. Rating teams are sometimes reconfigured here to take advantage of specific expertise; otherwise they remain the same throughout the round.
  2. Ratings are performed only on the criterion being appealed.
    - a. No new information is considered for the award of additional project points.
    - b. The appeal rating team awards points on the basis of the information in the original application.
    - c. Ratings for the appealed criterion may remain the same, be increased, or be decreased by the appeal rating team.

**6) PROJECT APPEALS RATING MEETING**

- a. A Project Appeals Rating Meeting is performed on the appealed projects in the same manner prescribed above for Project Rating Meeting.
- b. No further appeals to the Support Staff will be accepted.

## **V. PROJECT FUNDING**

### **A. FUNDING THE CURRENT ROUND**

#### **1) Ranking the projects**

- a. When the appeals meeting is complete, the projects are ranked in the order of cumulative SCIP and LTIP score (tiebreakers included) – tiebreakers are Rating Category 1 – Condition and Rating Category 14 – Number of Users. The two outcomes are Called “Priority Listings”.**
- b. The District Liaison and the Technical Assistants get together to review the Priority Listings and prepare a recommendation for the rest of the Support Staff showing how project funds (SCIP Grant, RLP, Allocation Loans, and Loan Assistance; LTIP Grant) are to be allocated. The resulting recommendations are Based on the location of a “cut line” on each Priority Listing. These lines are established as immediately below the lowest ranked grant project on both the SCIP and LTIP Priority Listing. This place on the list is where the available balance at that point In the allocation process has been diminished to the point where The next listed project cannot be funded at 100% of its requested Amount. The cut lines are established using the following criteria:**
  - 1. Determine the projects’ allowable funding source (SCIP Grant, RLP, Allocation Loans, and Loan Assistance; LTIP Grant) based on O.R.C. Chapter 164).**
  - 2. Consider the district’s project splitting policy.**
    - a. Projects whose total estimated cost (Line 1.1g on the OPWC application) are at least 2 million dollars and can be built over 2 construction seasons are split into two completely separate projects, one for each construction season.**
    - c. If approved as a split project, the second season’s funding commitment is automatically carried over into the next funding round.**
  - 3. Consider the district’s loan minimum responsibilities.**
    - a. Recommend all loans above the cut line for funding as a loan.**
    - b. If the district’s loan minimum responsibilities are not met by the loans above the cut line, the District Liaison begins at the next “loan eligible” project (i.e., the application is from a user-fee funded agency or the jurisdiction has indicated its inclination to accept a loan if grant funding is not available) below the SCIP Priority Listing cut line, and calls the jurisdiction to ask if they will accept funding of their project in the form of a loan. The jurisdiction is asked to provide a written acknowledgement of their decision via email to the District Liaison within one working day as a record of the loan being offered.**
    - c. The District Liaison continues in that manner until the minimum SCIP loan and RLP loan requirement for the district is met. The Integrating Committee is not limited in the amount of loans it may wish to implement above the**

minimum amount (20% of the allocation). It is possible to loan out the entire allocation if the Integrating Committee wishes to do so, or any amount in-between. Since loans may not be combined from the two funding sources, the District Liaison will select which fund to designate for each approved application with the objective of maximizing the number of loan projects funded in a given round.

- d. Projects receiving SCIP loans will be funded at 100% of their request, even if the allocation of the lowest ranked loan project will result in the SCIP allocation exceeding the statutory minimum (currently 20% of the district SCIP allocation).
- e. Projects will continue to be selected for RLP loans until the balance has decreased to the point where the next loan eligible project on the SCIP Priority Listing cannot be funded at 100% of its request. Projects unfunded at that point will be eligible to receive "residual funding" when OPWC adds funding to the districts' RLP balance.

**4. LTIP MINIMUM**

- a. The district must meet a minimum funding for LTIP projects. To deal with this requirement, the District Liaison monitor's LTIP allocations and compares it to the minimum requirements. If there is a significant disparity between the actual and the requirement, adjustments will be recommended to the Integrating Committee to resolve the deficiency.

**5. SMALL GOVERNMENT FUNDING RESPONSIBILITIES**

- a. The district is eligible to submit projects to the OPWC for funding consideration through the Small Government Commission.
- b. The Small Government Commission considers funding on a project submitted by an applying agency which serves a population base of less than 5,000 residents.
- c. The Small Government Commission has its own rating methodology to rate and rank projects.
- d. The District Liaison places eligible projects into a Priority Listing for the district's Integrating Committee. The Priority Listing is designed to award additional "district" points to the projects in descending order, in an effort to maximize each project's chance of obtaining funding through the Small Government Commission.
- e. A project which is eligible for funding under the Small Government Commission that is also eligible for funding through the District's rating system must first be considered by the district. If the project is within the range of funding under the districts funding process it must be funded by the district and not the Small Government Commission.

**6. THE DISTRICT'S USEFUL LIFE REQUIREMENT**

- a. The average useful life of the accumulation of all projects recommended for funding cannot be less than 20 years. This is required of the SCIP, LTIP, and RLP programs.

7. The District Liaison and the Technical Assistants determine which projects are recommended for funding under the appropriate funding source by providing the maximum number of projects funded by the district with all of the above consideration met. They then assemble the Recommended Funding Package, which consists of the following: Priority Listing of projects for both SCIP and LTIP; the grant funding recommendations for both SCIP and LTIP; the SCIP loan/loan assistance program funding recommendations; the RLP loan funding recommendations; the Small Government program funding recommendations; and the cumulative useful life for the SCIP, LTIP, and RLP programs.
8. **PROJECT LEGAL APPROVAL**
  - a. The District Liaison then distributes the Recommended Funding Package to each member of the Support Staff for final approval of its content. After Support Staff consensus, the District Liaison distributes the Recommended Funding Package to the Integrating Committee and the alternate members. The Integrating Committee then convenes at its regularly scheduled meeting in December of each year to consider the Recommended Funding Package. This is referred to as the voting meeting.
  - b. At the voting meeting, each funded project must receive 7 out of the possible 9 votes by the Integrating Committee members in order to be approved for funding.
  - c. The Integrating Committee also approves the Priority Listing of projects which will be used in the future of the round for residual funding of projects.
  - d. After the entire Recommended Funding Package is approved by the Integrating Committee, the District Liaison files the package with the Ohio Public Works Commission for its approval.
9. **RESIDUAL PROJECT FUNDING**
  - a. If a project from previous funding rounds closes out with OPWC funds still available to that project, the OPWC returns that funding back to the district's available balance. These funds are called "residual funds" and may be in the form of SCIP loan fund monies, SCIP grant fund monies, or LTIP grant fund monies.
  - b. Additionally, as loans from previous funding rounds are repaid, those repayments are returned to the district and put into the Revolving Loan Fund, which is available in the next round of funding.
  - c. When Residual funds become available, the District Liaison is informed by OPWC that such funds are available, and from what program. If enough funds are available, the appropriate Priority Listing is then used to fund additional projects. Projects below the original cut line are funded in order. SCIP and LTIP funds cannot be mixed.

- d. If it is not reasonable to believe that the next available project can be funded, and the applying agency refuses a reduced funding amount, the District Liaison will ask the applying agency to resubmit that project for a future round and the project will be bypassed for future residual funding consideration.
- e. Residual funds are available for any particular round of funding until the date that the next fiscal year cycle is approved by the Integrating Committee (typically at the next voting meeting).

## **VI. ANNUAL SYSTEM REVIEW**

### **A. The Rating System**

- 1. The district's rating system was developed after an extremely detailed review of the law which governs the OPWC and the program.
- 2. Annually, the entire program is reviewed to insure the program's integrity and its compliance with the law and the district's methods.
- 3. At the Support Staff's annual review meeting any problems from the previous round are discussed and any methodology or definition changes (formed by consensus) are sent to the Integrating Committee for its consideration.
- 4. The District Liaison annually reviews any changes in the economic health ratings and adjusts the jurisdictional positions accordingly.

**PER CAPITA INCOME****TABLE 1**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>\$/CAPITA</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
INDIAN HILL	\$96,842.00	10.0
AMBERLEY	\$51,225.00	9.8
MONTGOMERY	\$45,460.00	9.6
TERRACE PARK	\$42,391.00	9.4
EVENDALE	\$41,734.00	9.2
GLENDALE	\$40,787.00	9.0
SYMMES TWP.	\$39,076.00	8.8
WYOMING	\$38,180.00	8.6
ANDERSON TWP.	\$33,949.00	8.4
BLUE ASH	\$33,801.00	8.2
MARIEMONT	\$32,897.00	8.0
NEWTOWN	\$32,590.00	7.8
MADEIRA	\$30,676.00	7.6
SYCAMORE TWP.	\$29,367.00	7.4
NORTH BEND	\$28,792.00	7.2
SHARONVILLE	\$27,483.00	7.0
MIAMI TWP.	\$27,353.00	6.8
GREEN TWP.	\$26,391.00	6.6
LOVELAND	\$25,920.00	6.4
HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP)	\$25,733.00	6.2
WOODLAWN	\$24,204.00	6.0
CROSBY TWP.	\$23,723.00	5.8
SPRINGDALE	\$23,688.00	5.6
READING	\$23,527.00	5.4
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	\$23,476.00	5.2
GREENHILLS	\$23,240.00	5.0
DELHI TWP.	\$22,889.00	4.8
COLUMBIA TWP.	\$22,880.00	4.6
DEER PARK	\$22,274.00	4.4
COLERAIN TWP.	\$22,245.00	4.2
FOREST PARK	\$21,820.00	4.0
HARRISON TWP.	\$20,737.00	3.8
CINCINNATI	\$19,962.00	3.6
FAIRFAX	\$19,699.00	3.4
CHEVIOT	\$19,686.00	3.2
GOLF MANOR	\$19,044.00	3.0
SILVERTON	\$18,971.00	2.8
N. COLLEGE HILL	\$18,915.00	2.6
MT. HEALTHY	\$18,662.00	2.4
NORWOOD	\$18,108.00	2.2
ST. BERNARD	\$18,036.00	2.0
HARRISON	\$17,966.00	1.8
ARLINGTON HTS.	\$17,683.00	1.6
CLEVES	\$17,617.00	1.4
WHITEWATER TWP.	\$16,713.00	1.2
LOCKLAND	\$15,661.00	1.0
ELMWOOD PLACE	\$13,466.00	0.8
ADDYSTON	\$13,266.00	0.6
LINCOLN HTS.	\$12,121.00	0.4

**SOURCES: 2000 CENSUS****HAMILTON COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

# PROPERTY TAX EVALUATION PER CAPITA

TABLE 2

JURISDICTION	\$/CAPITA	POPULATION	VALUATION	POINTS
INDIAN HILL	\$170,747.79	5,653	\$965,237,240.00	10.0
TERRACE PARK	\$97,029.57	2,171	\$210,651,190.00	9.8
EVENDALE	\$67,604.10	2,932	\$198,215,230.00	9.6
BLUE ASH	\$58,382.03	11,917	\$695,738,650.00	9.4
AMBERLEY	\$54,576.94	3,310	\$180,649,670.00	9.2
GLENDALE	\$51,891.98	2,163	\$112,242,350.00	9.0
NORTH BEND	\$50,147.16	602	\$30,188,590.00	8.8
MONTGOMERY	\$45,984.97	10,147	\$466,609,540.00	8.6
SPRINGDALE	\$44,343.51	9,950	\$441,217,930.00	8.4
WYOMING	\$38,652.28	7,856	\$303,652,350.00	8.2
SYMMES TWP.	\$38,551.24	14,615	\$563,426,410.00	8.0
MARIEMONT	\$37,531.47	3,183	\$119,462,660.00	7.8
NEWTOWN	\$36,592.92	2,356	\$86,212,910.00	7.6
WOODLAWN	\$36,204.98	2,633	\$95,327,720.00	7.4
MADEIRA	\$35,086.14	8,464	\$296,969,090.00	7.2
SYCAMORE TWP.	\$34,920.04	19,300	\$673,956,680.00	7.0
SHARONVILLE	\$34,601.62	13,299	\$460,167,010.00	6.8
FAIRFAX	\$30,306.58	1,819	\$55,127,670.00	6.6
MIAMI TWP.	\$28,683.24	10,463	\$300,112,690.00	6.4
ANDERSON TWP.	\$28,363.64	42,045	\$1,192,549,290.00	6.2
COLUMBIA TWP.	\$27,969.68	4,448	\$124,409,150.00	6.0
HARRISON	\$25,811.82	7,584	\$195,756,880.00	5.8
HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP)	\$24,109.76	282,201	\$6,803,798,440.00	5.6
CROSBY TWP.	\$23,856.70	2,748	\$65,558,220.00	5.4
COLERAIN TWP.	\$21,622.36	58,009	\$1,254,291,670.00	5.2
GREEN TWP.	\$21,040.68	57,085	\$1,201,106,950.00	5.0
FOREST PARK	\$20,863.76	18,381	\$383,496,830.00	4.8
ST. BERNARD	\$19,731.97	4,583	\$90,431,620.00	4.6
CLEVES	\$19,717.16	2,603	\$51,323,760.00	4.4
LOVELAND	\$19,530.26	11,285	\$220,398,950.00	4.2
HARRISON TWP.	\$19,005.91	5,150	\$97,880,450.00	4.0
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	\$18,954.49	36,206	\$686,266,200.00	3.8
READING	\$18,816.77	10,521	\$197,971,210.00	3.6
DEER PARK	\$18,771.60	5,681	\$106,641,450.00	3.4
CINCINNATI	\$18,640.17	314,154	\$5,855,884,910.00	3.2
SILVERTON	\$18,491.00	4,828	\$89,274,570.00	3.0
WHITEWATER TWP.	\$18,146.71	5,584	\$101,331,230.00	2.8
NORWOOD	\$18,129.62	20,405	\$369,934,800.00	2.6
DELHI TWP.	\$17,690.62	30,689	\$542,907,500.00	2.4
GREENHILLS	\$16,928.44	3,832	\$64,869,790.00	2.2
LOCKLAND	\$15,991.77	3,451	\$55,187,600.00	2.0
CHEVIOT	\$15,809.26	8,399	\$132,781,960.00	1.8
ARLINGTON HTS.	\$15,791.15	838	\$13,232,980.00	1.6
N. COLLEGE HILL	\$15,025.97	9,528	\$143,167,480.00	1.4
ADDYSTON	\$14,537.47	975	\$14,174,030.00	1.2
GOLF MANOR	\$14,479.30	3,726	\$53,949,870.00	1.0
MT. HEALTHY	\$13,761.00	6,813	\$93,753,710.00	0.8
ELMWOOD PLACE	\$10,004.27	2,489	\$24,900,640.00	0.6
LINCOLN HTS.	\$7,835.98	3,879	\$30,395,780.00	0.4

SOURCES: HAMILTON COUNTY AUDITOR  
HAMILTON COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

FORMULA: TOTAL VALUATION / POPULATION

**INDEX OF POTENTIAL FOR ADDITIONAL REVENUE  
GENERATION FROM PROPERTY VALUATION**

**TABLE 3**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>INDEX</b>	<b>TABLE 2</b>	<b>TABLE 4</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
INDIAN HILL	9.20	10.0	0.8	10.0
EVENDALE	9.00	9.6	0.6	9.8
BLUE ASH	7.80	9.4	1.6	9.6
SPRINGDALE	7.00	8.4	1.4	9.4
SHARONVILLE	6.20	6.8	0.6	9.2
AMBERLEY	6.20	9.2	3.0	9.0
FAIRFAX	5.40	6.6	1.2	8.8
WOODLAWN	5.00	7.4	2.4	8.6
MADEIRA	3.80	7.2	3.4	8.4
ST. BERNARD	3.60	4.6	1.0	8.2
SYCAMORE TWP.	3.40	7.0	3.6	8.0
NORTH BEND	3.20	8.8	5.6	7.8
MONTGOMERY	3.20	8.6	5.4	7.6
WYOMING	3.00	8.2	5.2	7.4
READING	1.80	3.6	1.8	7.2
HARRISON TWP.	1.80	4.0	2.2	7.0
NEWTOWN	1.80	7.6	5.8	6.8
MIAMI TWP.	1.40	6.4	5.0	6.6
TERRACE PARK	1.40	9.8	8.4	6.4
DEER PARK	1.40	3.4	2.0	6.2
CROSBY TWP.	1.00	5.4	4.4	6.0
GREEN TWP.	0.80	5.0	4.2	5.8
MARIEMONT	0.40	7.8	7.4	5.6
SYMMES TWP.	0.20	8.0	7.8	5.4
COLUMBIA TWP.	(0.40)	6.0	6.4	5.2
GLENDALE	(0.40)	9.0	9.4	5.0
LOCKLAND	(0.80)	2.0	2.8	4.8
SILVERTON	(1.00)	3.0	4.0	4.6
ADDYSTON	(1.40)	1.2	2.6	4.4
HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP.)	(1.40)	5.6	7.0	4.2
CINCINNATI	(1.60)	3.2	4.8	4.0
FOREST PARK	(1.80)	4.8	6.6	3.8
HARRISON	(1.80)	5.8	7.6	3.6
N. COLLEGE HILL	(1.80)	1.4	3.2	3.4
ANDERSON TWP.	(2.00)	6.2	8.2	3.2
LOVELAND	(2.60)	4.2	6.8	3.0
ARLINGTON HTS.	(3.00)	1.6	4.6	2.8
MT. HEALTHY	(3.00)	0.8	3.8	2.6
COLERAIN TWP.	(3.40)	5.2	8.6	2.4
NORWOOD	(3.40)	2.6	6.0	2.2
WHITEWATER TWP.	(3.40)	2.8	6.2	2.0
CLEVES	(3.60)	4.4	8.0	1.8
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	(5.20)	3.8	9.0	1.6
CHEVIOT	(5.40)	1.8	7.2	1.4
DELHI TWP.	(6.80)	2.4	9.2	1.2
GREENHILLS	(7.80)	2.2	10.0	1.0
ELMWOOD PLACE	(8.20)	0.6	8.8	0.8
GOLF MANOR	(8.60)	1.0	9.6	0.6
LINCOLN HTS.	(9.40)	0.4	9.8	0.4

**SOURCES: HAMILTON COUNTY AUDITOR  
2000 CENSUS**

**FORMULA: (TABLE 2 RATING POSITION) - (TABLE 4 RATING POSITION)**



**EFFECTIVE CORPORATE AND  
TOWNSHIP LEVY RATES / \$1000**

**TABLE 4**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>LEVY RATES</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
GOLF MANOR	30.52	10.0
GREENHILLS	28.63	9.8
LINCOLN HTS.	28.33	9.6
DELHI TWP.	26.34	9.4
GLENDALE	21.39	9.2
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	20.81	9.0
COLUMBIA TWP.	20.06	8.8
TERRACE PARK	19.50	8.6
ELMWOOD PLACE	17.78	8.4
COLERAIN TWP.	16.18	8.2
CHEVIOT	14.52	8.0
MARIEMONT	14.37	7.8
ANDERSON TWP.	14.15	7.6
HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP.)	13.46	7.4
CLEVES	13.15	7.2
HARRISON	12.09	7.0
LOVELAND	11.97	6.8
FOREST PARK	11.92	6.6
SYMMES TWP.	11.90	6.4
WHITEWATER TWP.	11.44	6.2
NORWOOD	11.40	6.0
ST. BERNARD	11.28	5.8
MT. HEALTHY	11.11	5.6
NORTH BEND	10.09	5.4
MONTGOMERY	10.05	5.2
GREEN TWP.	9.81	5.0
ARLINGTON HTS.	9.52	4.8
MIAMI TWP.	9.45	4.6
CROSBY TWP.	9.24	4.4
WYOMING	9.18	4.2
CINCINNATI	9.18	4.0
SILVERTON	8.15	3.8
SYCAMORE TWP.	7.75	3.6
ADDYSTON	7.59	3.4
MADEIRA	7.50	3.2
N. COLLEGE HILL	7.33	3.0
AMBERLEY	7.00	2.8
LOCKLAND	6.02	2.6
NEWTOWN	5.28	2.4
WOODLAWN	5.08	2.2
HARRISON TWP.	3.74	2.0
DEER PARK	3.55	1.8
READING	3.52	1.6
BLUE ASH	3.08	1.4
SPRINGDALE	3.07	1.2
FAIRFAX	2.76	1.0
INDIAN HILL	0.96	0.8
EVENDALE	0.00	0.6
SHARONVILLE	0.00	0.6

**SOURCE: HAMILTON COUNTY AUDITOR**

**NOTE: IN JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE MORE THAN ONE TAXING DISTRICT WITH DIFFERENT RATES, AN AVERAGE OF ALL RATES IS USED.**

**RATES ARE EXCLUSIVE OF SCHOOL LEVY, FIRE DISTRICT LEVY, JOINT VOCATIONAL LEVY, SPECIAL DISTRICT LEVY, TOWNSHIP LEVY APPLIED TO MUNICIPALITIES, COUNTY LEVY (EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF HAMILTON COUNTY).**

**PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL VALUATION THAT  
IS RESIDENTIAL/AGRICULTURAL**

**TABLE 5**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>RES./AGR. VAL.</b>	<b>TOT VAL.</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
INDIAN HILL	0.99	\$958,601,440.00	\$965,237,240.00	10.0
WYOMING	0.95	\$288,716,530.00	\$303,652,350.00	9.8
AMBERLEY	0.95	\$171,592,620.00	\$180,649,670.00	9.6
GLENDALE	0.92	\$103,340,770.00	\$112,242,350.00	9.4
CLEVES	0.91	\$46,473,220.00	\$51,323,760.00	9.2
NORTH BEND	0.90	\$27,201,690.00	\$30,188,590.00	9.0
ANDERSON TWP.	0.90	\$1,070,829,090.00	\$1,192,549,290.00	8.8
GREEN TWP.	0.89	\$1,068,705,690.00	\$1,201,106,950.00	8.6
GREENHILLS	0.88	\$57,030,880.00	\$64,869,790.00	8.4
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	0.87	\$599,628,240.00	\$686,266,200.00	8.2
DELHI TWP.	0.87	\$474,308,640.00	\$542,907,500.00	8.0
MADEIRA	0.86	\$256,257,210.00	\$296,969,090.00	7.8
HARRISON TWP.	0.85	\$83,037,440.00	\$97,880,450.00	7.6
MARIEMONT	0.83	\$99,644,450.00	\$119,462,660.00	7.4
DEER PARK	0.82	\$87,732,900.00	\$106,641,450.00	7.2
CROSBY TWP.	0.82	\$53,714,690.00	\$65,558,220.00	7.0
MONTGOMERY	0.81	\$376,127,120.00	\$466,609,540.00	6.8
COLERAIN TWP.	0.81	\$1,010,368,020.00	\$1,254,291,670.00	6.6
LOVELAND	0.79	\$173,669,660.00	\$220,398,950.00	6.4
CHEVIOT	0.79	\$104,320,580.00	\$132,781,960.00	6.2
N. COLLEGE HILL	0.76	\$108,789,160.00	\$143,167,480.00	6.0
SYMMES TWP.	0.76	\$427,987,380.00	\$563,426,410.00	5.8
MIAMI TWP.	0.75	\$226,461,420.00	\$300,112,690.00	5.6
HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP.)	0.32	\$2,145,328,970.00	\$6,803,798,440.00	5.4
SILVERTON	0.72	\$64,420,050.00	\$89,274,570.00	5.2
NEWTOWN	0.72	\$62,133,060.00	\$86,212,910.00	5.0
GOLF MANOR	0.71	\$38,446,190.00	\$53,949,870.00	4.8
READING	0.70	\$139,320,920.00	\$197,971,210.00	4.6
HARRISON	0.67	\$130,999,850.00	\$195,756,880.00	4.4
COLUMBIA TWP.	0.66	\$82,316,670.00	\$124,409,150.00	4.2
MT. HEALTHY	0.66	\$61,559,330.00	\$93,753,710.00	4.0
SYCAMORE TWP.	0.65	\$438,809,960.00	\$673,956,680.00	3.8
NORWOOD	0.62	\$228,729,760.00	\$369,934,800.00	3.6
ST. BERNARD	0.61	\$55,084,390.00	\$90,431,620.00	3.4
ARLINGTON HTS.	0.59	\$7,846,330.00	\$13,232,980.00	3.2
CINCINNATI	0.59	\$3,461,558,010.00	\$5,855,884,910.00	3.0
FOREST PARK	0.59	\$224,730,920.00	\$383,496,830.00	2.8
ELMWOOD PLACE	0.58	\$14,535,480.00	\$24,900,640.00	2.6
LINCOLN HTS.	0.55	\$16,827,800.00	\$30,395,780.00	2.4
EVENDALE	0.55	\$108,234,400.00	\$198,215,230.00	2.2
ADDYSTON	0.54	\$7,717,740.00	\$14,174,030.00	2.0
WHITEWATER TWP.	0.54	\$54,440,130.00	\$101,331,230.00	1.8
TERRACE PARK	0.54	\$112,794,880.00	\$210,651,190.00	1.6
LOCKLAND	0.52	\$28,647,400.00	\$55,187,600.00	1.4
FAIRFAX	0.47	\$26,144,150.00	\$55,127,670.00	1.2
BLUE ASH	0.46	\$319,351,660.00	\$695,738,650.00	1.0
SHARONVILLE	0.41	\$189,344,060.00	\$460,167,010.00	0.8
SPRINGDALE	0.31	\$137,307,400.00	\$441,217,930.00	0.6
WOODLAWN	0.30	\$29,059,140.00	\$95,327,720.00	0.4

**SOURCE: HAMILTON COUNTY AUDITOR**

**FORMULA: (RESIDENTIAL VALUATION + AGRICULTURAL VALUATION) / TOTAL VALUATION**

# PER CENT OF POPULATION BELOW POVERTY LEVEL

TABLE 6

JURISDICTION	% FAMILIES	% PERSONS	POINTS
EVENDALE	0.00	0.30	10.0
WYOMING	0.70	1.40	9.8
MADEIRA	0.80	1.30	9.6
GLENDALE	0.80	2.10	9.4
INDIAN HILL	1.60	2.40	9.2
TERRACE PARK	1.70	2.00	9.0
HARRISON TWP.	1.70	11.50	8.8
ANDERSON TWP.	1.80	2.40	8.6
SYMMES TWP.	1.90	2.20	8.4
MONTGOMERY	2.00	2.80	8.2
DELHI TWP.	2.00	2.80	8.0
GREEN TWP.	2.00	3.20	7.8
GREENHILLS	2.30	3.80	7.6
SHARONVILLE	2.50	4.00	7.4
FAIRFAX	2.60	5.10	7.2
CROSBY TWP.	2.70	3.70	7.0
SYCAMORE TWP.	2.70	3.90	6.8
AMBERLEY	3.50	3.50	6.6
HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP.)	3.60	4.60	6.4
MARIEMONT	3.60	5.00	6.2
COLERAIN TWP.	3.60	5.10	6.0
DEER PARK	3.70	5.30	5.8
BLUE ASH	3.80	4.70	5.6
MIAMI TWP.	4.20	5.90	5.4
HARRISON	4.30	6.80	5.2
READING	4.70	7.30	5.0
NORTH BEND	4.90	6.50	4.8
NEWTOWN	4.90	7.10	4.6
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	5.00	6.60	4.4
FOREST PARK	5.10	6.00	4.2
CHEVIOT	5.20	7.60	4.0
LOVELAND	5.70	5.70	3.8
SILVERTON	5.80	9.50	3.6
WHITEWATER TWP.	6.10	8.70	3.4
CLEVES	6.30	7.60	3.2
N. COLLEGE HILL	6.80	8.70	3.0
MT. HEALTHY	6.80	8.90	2.8
ST. BERNARD	7.30	8.70	2.6
SPRINGDALE	7.70	8.90	2.4
NORWOOD	8.60	12.90	2.2
WOODLAWN	9.10	10.40	2.0
GOLF MANOR	9.20	10.70	1.8
ADDYSTON	9.20	11.60	1.6
ARLINGTON HTS.	10.20	13.00	1.4
COLUMBIA TWP.	12.10	11.10	1.2
LOCKLAND	14.20	17.10	1.0
CINCINNATI	18.20	21.90	0.8
ELMWOOD PLACE	20.20	19.00	0.6
LINCOLN HTS.	26.60	29.90	0.4

SOURCES: 2000 CENSUS

HAMILTON COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

**REVENUE PER CAPITA PERMISSIVE TAX LICENSE FEE****TABLE 7**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>INDEX</b>	<b>POPULATION</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
SHARONVILLE	9.84	13,299	10.0
EVENDALE	8.80	2,932	9.8
NEWTOWN	7.61	2,356	9.6
NORTH BEND	7.61	602	9.4
WOODLAWN	7.32	2,633	9.2
FAIRFAX	7.17	1,819	9.0
CROSBY TWP.	6.82	2,748	8.8
LOCKLAND	6.77	3,451	8.6
ARLINGTON HTS.	6.57	838	8.4
BLUE ASH	6.35	11,917	8.2
WHITEWATER TWP.	6.22	5,584	8.0
INDIAN HILL	6.05	5,653	7.8
AMBERLEY	6.00	3,310	7.6
GLENDALE	5.75	2,163	7.4
CLEVES	5.74	2,603	7.2
SYCAMORE TWP.	5.42	19,300	7.0
READING	5.34	10,521	6.8
HARRISON	5.24	7,584	6.6
SPRINGDALE	5.22	9,950	6.4
MONTGOMERY	5.09	10,147	6.2
TERRACE PARK	4.97	2,171	6.0
WYOMING	4.96	7,856	5.8
HAMILTON COUNTY (UNINCORP)	4.94	282,201	5.6
ST. BERNARD	4.92	4,583	5.4
ANDERSON TWP.	4.90	42,045	5.2
MADEIRA	4.90	8,464	5.0
FOREST PARK	4.88	18,381	4.8
HARRISON TWP.	4.85	5,150	4.6
GREEN TWP.	4.77	57,315	4.4
SILVERTON	4.77	4,828	4.2
SYMMES TWP.	4.74	14,615	4.0
MARIEMONT	4.73	3,183	3.8
COLERAIN TWP.	4.71	58,009	3.6
MIAMI TWP.	4.66	10,463	3.4
DEER PARK	4.51	5,681	3.2
CHEVIOT	4.47	8,399	3.0
MT. HEALTHY	4.37	6,813	2.8
ADDYSTON	4.36	975	2.6
GOLF MANOR	4.36	3,726	2.4
DELHI TWP.	4.35	30,689	2.2
GREENHILLS	4.28	3,832	2.0
NORWOOD	4.24	20,405	1.8
LOVELAND	4.15	11,285	1.6
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	4.14	36,206	1.4
N. COLLEGE HILL	3.91	9,528	1.2
ELMWOOD PLACE	3.79	2,489	1.0
COLUMBIA TWP.	3.73	4,448	0.8
LINCOLN HTS.	3.30	3,879	0.6
CINCINNATI	3.19	314,154	0.4

**SOURCES: BUREAU OF MOTOR VEHICLES  
2000 CENSUS**

**FORMULA : PERMISSIVE TAX LEVY REVENUES / POPULATION**

**POPULATION OF HAMILTON COUNTY JURISDICTIONS****TABLE 7A**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	
ADDYSTON	975
AMBERLEY	3,310
ANDERSON TWP.	42,045
ARLINGTON HTS.	838
BLUE ASH	11,917
CHEVIOT	8,399
CINCINNATI	314,154
CLEVES	2,603
COLERAIN TWP.	58,009
COLUMBIA TWP.	4,448
CROSBY TWP.	2,748
DEER PARK	5,681
DELHI TWP.	30,689
ELMWOOD PLACE	2,489
EVENDALE	2,932
FAIRFAX	1,819
FOREST PARK	18,381
GLENDALE	2,163
GOLF MANOR	3,726
GREEN TWP.	57,315
GREENHILLS	3,832
HAMILTON COUNTY (UNINCORP)	282,201
HARRISON	7,584
HARRISON TWP.	5,150
INDIAN HILL	5,653
LINCOLN HTS.	3,879
LOCKLAND	3,451
LOVELAND	9,102
MADEIRA	8,464
MARIEMONT	3,183
MIAMI TWP.	10,463
MONTGOMERY	10,147
MT. HEALTHY	6,813
N. COLLEGE HILL	9,528
NEWTOWN	2,356
NORTH BEND	602
NORWOOD	20,405
READING	10,521
SHARONVILLE	11,071
SILVERTON	4,828
SPRINGDALE	9,950
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	36,206
ST. BERNARD	4,583
SYCAMORE TWP.	19,300
SYMMES TWP.	14,615
TERRACE PARK	2,171
WHITEWATER TWP.	5,584
WOODLAWN	2,633
WYOMING	7,856
<hr/>	
814,571	

**SOURCES: HAMILTON COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

# **MUNICIPAL PAYROLL TAX INDEX**

**TABLE 8**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>ESTIMATED DAILY WORK FORCE</b>	<b>PAYROLL TAX RATE</b>	<b>POPULATION</b>	<b>PAYROLL TAX INDEX</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
FAIRFAX	15,000	1.75	1,819	14.43	5
EVENDALE	20,000	1.20	2,932	8.19	5
SPRINGDALE	44,037	1.50	9,950	6.64	5
BLUE ASH	70,000	1.00	11,917	5.87	5
SHARONVILLE	37,000	1.50	11,071	5.01	4
WOODLAWN	5,188	2.00	2,633	3.94	4
FOREST PARK	65,000	1.00	18,381	3.54	4
ST. BERNARD	5,308	2.10	4,583	2.43	4
HARRISON	15,000	1.00	7,584	1.98	4
CINCINNATI	250,000	2.10	314,154	1.67	4
MONTGOMERY	14,000	1.00	10,147	1.38	3
MT. HEALTHY	5,932	1.50	6,813	1.31	3
ARLINGTON HTS.	500	2.10	838	1.25	3
LOCKLAND	2,000	2.10	3,451	1.22	3
NORWOOD	12,112	2.00	20,405	1.19	3
READING	5,958	1.50	10,521	0.85	3
N. COLLEGE HILL	5,229	1.50	9,528	0.82	2
LINCOLN HTS.	1,425	2.00	3,879	0.73	2
DEER PARK	2,579	1.50	5,681	0.68	2
SILVERTON	2,587	1.25	4,828	0.67	2
MARIEMONT	1,703	1.25	3,183	0.67	2
MADEIRA	5,400	1.00	8,464	0.64	2
ADDYSTON	518	1.00	975	0.53	1
AMBERLEY	817	2.00	3,310	0.49	1
ELMWOOD PLACE	600	2.00	2,489	0.48	1
LOVELAND	4,180	1.00	9,102	0.46	1
GREENHILLS	900	1.50	3,832	0.35	1
NEWTOWN	809	1.00	2,356	0.34	1
CHEVIOT	1,084	2.00	8,399	0.26	0.8
GOLF MANOR	450	1.70	3,726	0.21	0.6
WYOMING	1,500	0.80	7,856	0.15	0.4
INDIAN HILL	425	0.30	5,653	0.02	0.2
CLEVES	114	0.00	2,603	0.00	0.00
GLENDALE	408	0.00	2,163	0.00	0.00
NORTH BEND	64	0.00	602	0.00	0.00
TERRACE PARK	100	0.00	2,171	0.00	0.00

597,927

527,999

**DAILY WORKFORCE NUMBERS UPDATED FEBRUARY 2006 SUBMITTED BY THE POLITICAL JURISDICTIONS**

**SOURCES: POLITICAL JURISDICTIONS; HAMILTON COUNTY AUDITOR; REGIONAL PLANNING; OKI  
2000 CENSUS**

**FORMULA: [(ESTIMATED DAILY WORK FORCE) (PAYROLL TAX RATE) ] / POPULATION**

<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>ESTIMATED DAILY WORK FORCE</b>	<b>PAYROLL TAX RATE</b>
ADDYSTON	518	1.00
AMBERLEY	817	2.00
ARLINGTON HTS.	500	2.10
BLUE ASH	70,000	1.00
CHEVIOT	1,084	2.00
CINCINNATI	250,000	2.10
CLEVES	114	0.00
DEER PARK	2,579	1.50
ELMWOOD PLACE	600	2.00
EVENDALE	20,000	0.90
FAIRFAX	15,000	1.25
FOREST PARK	65,000	1.00
GLENDALE	408	0.00
GOLF MANOR	450	1.70
GREENHILLS	800	1.00
HARRISON	15,000	1.00
INDIAN HILL	425	0.30
LINCOLN HTS.	1,425	2.00
LOCKLAND	2,000	2.10
LOVELAND	4,180	1.00
MADEIRA	5,400	1.00
MARIEMONT	1,703	1.25
MONTGOMERY	14,000	1.00
MT. HEALTHY	5,932	1.50
N. COLLEGE HILL	5,229	1.50
NEWTOWN	809	1.00
NORTH BEND	64	0.00
NORWOOD	12,112	2.00
READING	5,958	1.50
SHARONVILLE	37,000	1.50
SILVERTON	2,587	1.25
SPRINGDALE	44,037	1.00
ST. BERNARD	5,308	2.00
TERRACE PARK	100	0.00
WOODLAWN	5,188	2.00
WYOMING	1,500	0.50

**SOURCES: POLITICAL JURISDICTIONS; HAMILTON COUNTY AUDITOR; REGIONAL PLANNING; OKI  
2000 CENSUS**

**FORMULA: [(ESTIMATED DAILY WORK FORCE) (PAYROLL TAX RATE) ] / POPULATION**

# SUMMARY OF TABLES

TABLE 9

JURISDICTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	POINTS
WYOMING	8.6	8.2	7.4	5.2	9.8	9.8	8.8	0.4	58.2
GLENDALE	9.0	9.0	5.0	9.4	9.4	9.4	5.6	0.0	56.8
AMBERLEY	9.8	9.2	9.0	3.0	9.6	6.6	6.4	1.0	54.6
MADEIRA	7.6	7.2	8.4	3.4	7.8	9.6	8.4	2.0	54.4
EVENDALE	9.2	9.6	9.8	0.6	2.2	10.0	7.8	5.0	54.2
MONTGOMERY	9.6	8.6	7.6	5.4	6.8	8.2	5.0	3.0	54.2
NORTH BEND	7.2	8.8	7.8	5.6	9.0	4.8	9.6	0.0	52.8
INDIAN HILL	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.8	10.0	9.2	2.2	0.2	52.4
TERRACE PARK	9.4	9.8	6.4	8.4	1.6	9.0	3.8	0.0	48.4
BLUE ASH	8.2	9.4	9.6	1.6	1.0	5.6	6.8	5.0	47.2
ANDERSON TWP.	8.4	6.2	3.2	8.2	8.8	8.6	3.2	0.0	46.6
MARIEMONT	8.0	7.8	5.6	7.4	7.4	6.2	1.8	2.0	46.2
SHARONVILLE	7.0	6.8	9.2	0.6	0.8	7.4	9.8	4.0	45.6
SYMMES TWP.	8.8	8.0	5.4	7.8	5.8	8.4	0.8	0.0	45.0
GREENHILLS	5.0	2.2	1.0	10.0	8.4	7.6	8.0	1.0	43.2
GREEN TWP.	6.6	5.0	5.8	4.2	8.6	7.8	3.4	0.0	41.4
NEWTOWN	7.8	7.6	6.8	5.8	5.0	4.6	2.0	1.0	40.6
SYCAMORE TWP.	7.4	7.0	8.0	3.6	3.8	6.8	4.0	0.0	40.6
FOREST PARK	4.0	4.8	3.8	6.6	2.8	4.2	9.2	4.0	39.4
WOODLAWN	6.0	7.4	8.6	2.4	0.4	2.0	8.2	4.0	39.0
SPRINGDALE	5.6	8.4	9.4	1.4	0.6	2.4	5.8	5.0	38.6
LOVELAND	6.4	4.2	3.0	6.8	6.4	3.8	6.6	1.0	38.2
HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP)	6.2	5.6	4.2	7.0	5.4	6.4	2.6	0.0	37.4
HARRISON	1.8	5.8	3.6	7.6	4.4	5.2	4.8	4.0	37.2
CROSBY TWP.	5.8	5.4	6.0	4.4	7.0	7.0	1.2	0.0	36.8
COLERAIN TWP.	4.2	5.2	2.4	8.6	6.6	6.0	3.6	0.0	36.6
DELHI TWP.	4.8	2.4	1.2	9.2	8.0	8.0	3.0	0.0	36.6
MIAMI TWP.	6.8	6.4	6.6	5.0	5.6	5.4	0.4	0.0	36.2
READING	5.4	3.6	7.2	1.8	4.6	5.0	5.4	3.0	36.0
FAIRFAX	3.4	6.6	8.8	1.2	1.2	7.2	2.4	5.0	35.8
CLEVES	1.4	4.4	1.8	8.0	9.2	3.2	7.4	0.0	35.4
DEER PARK	4.4	3.4	6.2	2.0	7.2	5.8	4.4	2.0	35.4
SILVERTON	2.8	3.0	4.6	4.0	5.2	3.6	9.4	2.0	34.6
HARRISON TWP.	3.8	4.0	7.0	2.2	7.6	8.8	1.0	0.0	34.4
CHEVIOT	3.2	1.8	1.4	7.2	6.2	4.0	8.6	0.8	33.2
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	5.2	3.8	1.6	9.0	8.2	4.4	0.6	0.0	32.8
ST. BERNARD	2.0	4.6	8.2	1.0	3.4	2.6	6.2	4.0	32.0
GOLF MANOR	3.0	1.0	0.6	9.6	4.8	1.8	9.0	0.6	30.4
CINCINNATI	3.6	3.2	4.0	4.8	3.0	0.8	6.0	4.0	29.4
COLUMBIA TWP.	4.6	6.0	5.2	6.4	4.2	1.2	1.6	0.0	29.2
N. COLLEGE HILL	2.6	1.4	3.4	3.2	6.0	3.0	7.0	2.0	28.6
MT. HEALTHY	2.4	0.8	2.6	3.8	4.0	2.8	7.6	3.0	27.0
LOCKLAND	1.0	2.0	4.8	2.8	1.4	1.0	10.0	3.0	26.0
NORWOOD	2.2	2.6	2.2	6.0	3.6	2.2	4.2	3.0	26.0
ARLINGTON HTS.	1.6	1.6	2.8	4.6	3.2	1.4	5.2	3.0	23.4
ELMWOOD PLACE	0.8	0.6	0.8	8.8	2.6	0.6	7.2	1.0	22.4
WHITEWATER TWP.	1.2	2.8	2.0	6.2	1.8	3.4	4.6	0.0	22.0
LINCOLN HTS.	0.4	0.4	0.4	9.8	2.4	0.4	2.8	2.0	18.6
ADDYSTON	0.6	1.2	4.4	2.6	2.0	1.6	1.4	1.0	14.8



RELATIVE ECONOMIC STRENGTH - TABLES 1-8

TABLE 10

	JURISDICTION	TOTAL POINTS	RATING POINTS	
	WYOMING	58.2		2 = LOSS
	GLENDALE	56.8		2 = GAIN
	AMBERLEY	54.6		
2	MADEIRA	54.4		
	EVENDALE	54.2	2	
	MONTGOMERY	54.2		
2	NORTH BEND	52.8		
2	INDIAN HILL	52.4		
2	TERRACE PARK	48.4		
2	BLUE ASH	47.2		
2	ANDERSON TWP.	46.6		
	MARIEMONT	46.2		
2	SHARONVILLE	45.6		
	SYMMES TWP.	45.0		
2	GREENHILLS	43.2	4	
2	GREEN TWP.	41.4		
	NEWTOWN	40.6		
	SYCAMORE TWP.	40.6		
	FOREST PARK	39.4		
4	WOODLAWN	39.0		
4	SPRINGDALE	38.6		
	LOVELAND	38.2		
	HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP)	37.4		
	HARRISON	37.2		
2	CROSBY TWP.	36.8	6	
2	COLERAIN TWP.	36.6		
2	DELHI TWP.	36.6		
	MIAMI TWP.	36.2		
	READING	36.0		
4	FAIRFAX	35.8		
2	CLEVES	35.4		
	DEER PARK	35.4		
	SILVERTON	34.6		
2	HARRISON TWP.	34.4		
	CHEVIOT	33.2	8	
2	SPRINGFIELD TWP.	32.8		
2	ST. BERNARD	32.0		
	GOLF MANOR	30.4		
2	CINCINNATI	29.4		
2	COLUMBIA TWP.	29.2		
	N. COLLEGE HILL	28.6		
	MT. HEALTHY	27.0		
2	LOCKLAND	26.0		
	NORWOOD	26.0		
	ARLINGTON HTS.	23.4		
	ELMWOOD PLACE	22.4	10	
2	WHITEWATER TWP.	22.0		
	LINCOLN HTS.	18.6		
	ADDYSTON	14.8		

## RELATIVE ECONOMIC STRENGTH - TABLES 1- 8

TABLE 10

JURISDICTION	TOTAL POINTS	RATING POINTS
WYOMING	58.2	<b>2</b>
GLENDALE	56.8	
AMBERLEY	54.6	
MADEIRA	54.4	
EVENDALE	54.2	
MONTGOMERY	54.2	
NORTH BEND	52.8	
INDIAN HILL	52.4	
TERRACE PARK	48.4	<b>4</b>
BLUE ASH	47.2	
ANDERSON TWP.	46.6	
MARIEMONT	46.2	
SHARONVILLE	45.6	
SYMMES TWP.	45.0	
GREENHILLS	43.2	
GREEN TWP.	41.4	<b>6</b>
NEWTOWN	40.6	
SYCAMORE TWP.	40.6	
FOREST PARK	39.4	
WOODLAWN	39.0	
SPRINGDALE	38.6	
LOVELAND	38.2	
HAMILTON CO. (UNINCORP)	37.4	
HARRISON	37.2	<b>8</b>
CROSBY TWP.	36.8	
COLERAIN TWP.	36.6	
DELHI TWP.	36.6	
MIAMI TWP.	36.2	
READING	36.0	
FAIRFAX	35.8	<b>10</b>
CLEVES	35.4	
DEER PARK	35.4	
SILVERTON	34.6	
HARRISON TWP.	34.4	
CHEVIOT	33.2	
SPRINGFIELD TWP.	32.8	
ST. BERNARD	32.0	
GOLF MANOR	30.4	<b>10</b>
CINCINNATI	29.4	
COLUMBIA TWP.	29.2	
N. COLLEGE HILL	28.6	
MT. HEALTHY	27.0	
LOCKLAND	26.0	
NORWOOD	26.0	
ARLINGTON HTS.	23.4	
ELMWOOD PLACE	22.4	
WHITEWATER TWP.	22.0	<b>10</b>
LINCOLN HTS.	18.6	
ADDYSTON	14.8	

# ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION

For Program Year 2007 (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008), applying agencies shall provide the following support information to help determine which projects will be funded. Information on this form must be accurate, and where called for, based on sound engineering principles. Documentation to substantiate the individual items, as noted, is required. The applicant should also use the rating system and its' addendum as a guide. The examples listed in this addendum are not a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to a given project.

**IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR A GRANT, WILL YOU BE WILLING TO ACCEPT A LOAN IF ASKED BY THE DISTRICT? \_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO (ANSWER REQUIRED)**

Note: Answering "Yes" will not increase your score and answering "NO" will not decrease your score.

**1) What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired?**

Give a statement of the nature of the deficient conditions of the present facility exclusive of capacity, serviceability, health and/or safety issues. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded. Use documentation (if possible) to support your statement. Documentation may include (but is not limited to): ODOT BR86 reports, pavement management condition reports, televised underground system reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included in the original application. Examples of deficiencies include: structural condition; substandard design elements such as widths, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage structures, etc.

---

---

---

---

**2) How important is the project to the safety of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?**

Give a statement of the projects effect on the safety of the service area. The design of the project is intended to reduce existing accident rate, promote safer conditions, and reduce the danger of risk, liability or injury. (Typical examples may include the effects of the completed project on accident rates, emergency response time, fire protection, and highway capacity.) Please be specific and provide documentation if necessary to substantiate the data. The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems and the method of correction.

---

---

---

---

**3) How important is the project to the health of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?**

Give a statement of the projects effect on the health of the service area. The design of the project will improve the overall condition of the facility so as to reduce or eliminate potential for disease, or correct concerns regarding the environmental health of the area. (Typical examples may include the effects of the completed project by improving or adding storm drainage or sanitary facilities, replacing lead jointed water lines, etc.). Please be specific and provide documentation if necessary to substantiate the data. The applying agency must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems and the method of correction.

---

---

---

---

**4) Does the project help meet the infrastructure repair and replacement needs of the applying jurisdiction?**

The applying agency must submit a listing in priority order of the projects for which it is applying. Points will be awarded on the basis of most to least importance.

**Priority 1** \_\_\_\_\_

**Priority 2** \_\_\_\_\_

**Priority 3** \_\_\_\_\_

**Priority 4** \_\_\_\_\_

**Priority 5** \_\_\_\_\_

**5) To what extent will the user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project?**

(example: rates for water or sewer, frontage assessments, etc.).

---

---

---

---

**6) Economic Growth – How will the completed project enhance economic growth**

Give a statement of the projects effect on the economic growth of the service area (be specific).

---

---

---

---

---

**7) Matching Funds - LOCAL**

The information regarding local matching funds is to be filed by the applying agency in Section 1.2 (b) of the Ohio Public Works Association's "Application For Financial Assistance" form.

**8) Matching Funds - OTHER**

The information regarding local matching funds is to be filed by the applying agency in Section 1.2 (c) of the Ohio Public Works Association's "Application For Financial Assistance" form. If MRF funds are being used for matching funds, the MRF application must have been filed by Friday, September 1, 2006 for this project with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office. List below all "other" funding the source(s).

---

---

---

---

9) Will the project alleviate serious capacity problems or respond to the future level of service needs of the district?

Describe how the proposed project will alleviate serious capacity problems (be specific).

---

---

---

---

---

For roadway betterment projects, provide the existing and proposed Level of Service (LOS) of the facility using the methodology outlined within AASHTO'S "Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" and the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual.

Existing LOS \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed LOS \_\_\_\_\_

If the proposed design year LOS is not "C" or better, explain why LOS "C" cannot be achieved.

---

---

---

---

10) If SCIP/LTIP funds were granted, when would the construction contract be awarded?

If SCIP/LTIP funds are awarded, how soon after receiving the Project Agreement from OPWC (tentatively set for July 1 of the year following the deadline for applications) would the project be under contract? The Support Staff will review status reports of previous projects to help judge the accuracy of a jurisdiction's anticipated project schedule.

Number of months \_\_\_\_\_

a.) Are preliminary plans or engineering completed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

b.) Are detailed construction plans completed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

c.) Are all utility coordination's completed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

d.) Are all right-of-way and easements acquired (if applicable)? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

If no, how many parcels needed for project? \_\_\_\_\_ Of these, how many are: Takes \_\_\_\_\_

Temporary \_\_\_\_\_

Permanent \_\_\_\_\_

For any parcels not yet acquired, explain the status of the ROW acquisition process for this project.

---

---

---

---

e.) Give an estimate of time needed to complete any item above not yet completed. \_\_\_\_\_ Months.

**11) Does the infrastructure have regional impact?**

Give a brief statement concerning the regional significance of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

---

---

---

---

**12) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?**

The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the jurisdiction's economic health. The economic health of a jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when census and other budgetary data are updated.

**13) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure?**

Describe what formal action has been taken which resulted in a ban of the use of or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? Typical examples include weight limits, truck restrictions, and moratoriums or limitations on issuance of building permits, etc. The ban must have been caused by a structural or operational problem to be considered valid. Submission of a copy of the approved legislation would be helpful.

---

---

---

---

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

**14) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project?**

For roads and bridges, multiply current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) by 1.20. For inclusion of public transit, submit documentation substantiating the count. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to the restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by 4. User information must be documented and certified by a professional engineer or the jurisdictions' C.E.O.

Traffic: ADT \_\_\_\_\_ X 1.20 = \_\_\_\_\_ Users

Water/Sewer: Homes \_\_\_\_\_ X 4.00 = \_\_\_\_\_ Users

**15) Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or dedicated tax for the pertinent infrastructure?**

The applying jurisdiction shall list what type of fees, levies or taxes they have dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for. (Check all that apply)

Optional \$5.00 License Tax \_\_\_\_\_

Infrastructure Levy \_\_\_\_\_ Specify type \_\_\_\_\_

Facility Users Fee \_\_\_\_\_ Specify type \_\_\_\_\_

Dedicated Tax \_\_\_\_\_ Specify type \_\_\_\_\_

Other Fee, Levy or Tax \_\_\_\_\_ Specify type \_\_\_\_\_

**SCIP/LTIP PROGRAM  
ROUND 21 - PROGRAM YEAR 2007  
PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA  
JULY 1, 2007 TO JUNE 30, 2008**

**NAME OF APPLICANT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF PROJECT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**RATING TEAM:** \_\_\_\_\_

**General Statement for Rating Criteria**

Points awarded for all items will be based on engineering experience, field verification, application information and other information supplied by the applying agency, which is deemed to be relevant by the Support Staff. The examples listed in this addendum are not a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to a given project.

**CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RATING**

1) What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired?

25 - Failed  
23 - Critical  
20 - Very Poor  
17 - Poor  
15 - Moderately Poor  
10 - Moderately Fair  
5 - Fair Condition  
0 - Good or Better

**Appeal Score**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 1 - Condition**

Condition of the particular infrastructure to be repaired, reconstructed or replaced shall be a measure of the degree of reduction in condition from its original state. Capacity, serviceability, safety and health shall not be considered in this criterion. Any documentation the Applicant wishes to be considered must be included in the application package.

**Definitions:**

**Failed Condition** - requires complete reconstruction where no part of the existing facility is salvageable. (E.g. Roads: complete reconstruction of roadway, curbs and base; Bridges: complete removal and replacement of bridge; Underground: removal and replacement of an underground drainage or water system.

**Critical Condition** - requires partial reconstruction to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: reconstruction of roadway/curbs can be saved; Bridges: removal and replacement of bridge with abutment modification; Underground: removal and replacement of part of an underground drainage or water system.

**Very Poor Condition** - requires extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: extensive full depth, partial depth and curb repair of a roadway with a structural overlay; Bridges: superstructure replacement; Underground: repair of joints and/or replacement of pipe sections.

**Poor Condition** - requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: moderate full depth, partial depth and curb repair to a roadway with no structural overlay needed or structural overlay with minor repairs to a roadway needed; Bridges: extensive patching of substructure and replacement of deck; Underground: insituform or other in ground repairs.

**Moderately Poor Condition** - requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: minor full depth, partial depth or curb repairs to a roadway with either a thin overlay or no overlay needed; Bridges: major structural patching and/or major deck repair.

**Moderately Fair Condition** - requires extensive maintenance to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: thin or no overlay with extensive crack sealing, minor partial depth and/or slurry or rejuvenation; Bridges: minor structural patching, deck repair, erosion control.)

**Fair Condition** - requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: slurry seal, rejuvenation or routine crack sealing to the roadway; Bridges: minor structural patching.)

**Good or Better Condition** - little to no maintenance required to maintain integrity.

**Note:** If the infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will **NOT** be considered for SCIP/LTIP funding unless it is an expansion project that will improve serviceability.

2) How important is the project to the safety of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

- 25 - Highly significant importance
- 20 - Considerably significant importance
- 15 - Moderate importance
- 10 - Minimal importance
- 5 - Poorly documented importance
- 0 - No measurable impact

Appeal Score  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 2 – Safety**

The applying agency shall include in its application the type, frequency, and severity of the safety problem that currently exists and how the intended project would improve the situation. For example, have there been vehicular accidents attributable to the problems cited? Have they involved injuries or fatalities? In the case of water systems, are existing hydrants non-functional? In the case of water lines, is the present capacity inadequate to provide volumes or pressure for adequate fire protection? **In all cases, specific documentation is required.** Mentioned problems, which are poorly documented, shall not receive more than 5 points.

Note: Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply. **Examples given above are NOT intended to be exclusive.**

3) How important is the project to the health of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

- 25 - Highly significant importance
- 20 - Considerably significant importance
- 15 - Moderate importance
- 10 - Minimal importance
- 5 - Poorly documented importance
- 0 - No measurable impact

Appeal Score  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 3 – Health**

The applying agency shall include in its application the type, frequency, and severity of the health problem that would be eliminated or reduced by the intended project. For example, can the problem be eliminated only by the project, or would routine maintenance be satisfactory? If basement flooding has occurred, was it storm water or sanitary flow? What complaints if any are recorded? In the case of underground improvements, how will they improve health if they are storm sewers? How would improved sanitary sewers improve health or reduce health risk? **In all cases, quantified documentation is required.** Mentioned problems, which are poorly documented, shall not receive more than 5 points.

Note: Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply. **Examples given above are NOT intended to be exclusive.**

4) Does the project help meet the infrastructure repair and replacement needs of the applying agency?

**Note:** Applying agency's priority listing (part of the Additional Support Information) must be filed with application(s).

- 25 - First priority project
- 20 - Second priority project
- 15 - Third priority project
- 10 - Fourth priority project
- 5 - Fifth priority project or lower

Appeal Score  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 4 – Jurisdiction's Priority Listing**

The applying agency **must** submit a listing in priority order of the projects for which it is applying. Points will be awarded on the basis of most to least importance. The form is included in the Additional Support Information.



- 5) To what extent will a user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project?
- 10 – Less than 10%
  - 9 – 10% to 19.99%
  - 8 – 20% to 29.99%
  - 7 – 30% to 39.99%
  - 6 – 40% to 49.99%
  - 5 – 50% to 59.99%
  - 4 – 60% to 69.99%
  - 3 – 70% to 79.99%
  - 2 – 80% to 89.99%
  - 1 – 90% to 95%
  - 0 – Above 95%

Appeal Score  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 5 – User Fee-funded Agency Participation**

To what extent will a user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project? (Example: rates for water or sewer, frontage assessments, etc.). The applying agency must submit documentation.

- 6) Economic Growth – How the completed project will enhance economic growth (See definitions).

- 10 – The project will **directly** secure new employment
- 5 – The project will permit more development
- 0 – The project will not impact development

Appeal Score  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 6 – Economic Growth**

Will the completed project enhance economic growth and/or development in the service area?

**Definitions:**

**Secure new employment:** The project as designed will secure development/employers, which will immediately add new permanent employees to the jurisdiction. The applying agency must submit details.

**Permit more development:** The project as designed will permit additional business development/employment. The applying agency must supply details.

**The project will not impact development:** The project will have no impact on business development.

**Note:** Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply.

- 7) Matching Funds - **LOCAL**

- 10 - This project is a loan or credit enhancement
- 10 – 50% or higher
- 8 – 40% to 49.99%
- 6 – 30% to 39.99%
- 4 – 20% to 29.99%
- 2 – 10% to 19.99%
- 0 – Less than 10%

List total percentage of “Local” funds \_\_\_\_\_%

**Criterion 7 – Matching Funds – Local**

The percentage of matching funds which come directly from the budget of the applying agency. Ten points shall be awarded if a loan request is at least 50% of the total project cost. (If the applying agency is not a user fee funded agency, any funds to be provided by a user fee generating agency will be considered "Matching Funds – Other")

8) Matching Funds – **OTHER** List total percentage of “Other” funds \_\_\_\_\_%

10 – 50% or higher	List below each funding source and percentage	
8 – 40% to 49.99%	_____	_____%
6 – 30% to 39.99%	_____	_____%
4 – 20% to 29.99%	_____	_____%
2 – 10% to 19.99%	_____	_____%
1 – 1% to 9.99%	_____	_____%
0 – Less than 1%	_____	_____%

**Criterion 8 – Matching Funds - Other**  
The percentage of matching funds that come from funding sources other than those mentioned in Criterion 7. A letter from the outside funding agency stating their financial participation in the project and the amount of funding is required to receive points. For MRF, a copy of the current application form filed with the Hamilton County Engineer’s Office meets the requirement.

9) Will the project alleviate serious capacity problems or hazards or respond to the future level of service needs of the district?

10 - Project design is for future demand.	Appeal Score
8 - Project design is for partial future demand.	
6 - Project design is for current demand.	_____
4 - Project design is for minimal increase in capacity.	
2 - Project design is for no increase in capacity.	

**Criterion 9 – Alleviate Capacity Problems**  
The applying agency shall provide a narrative, along with pertinent support documentation, which describe the existing deficiencies and showing how congestion will be reduced or eliminated and how service will be improved to meet the needs of any expected growth or development. A formal capacity analysis accompanying the application would be beneficial. Projected traffic or demand should be calculated as follows:

**Formula:**  
Existing users x design year factor = projected users

Design Year	Design year factor		
	Urban	Suburban	Rural
20	1.40	1.70	1.60
10	1.20	1.35	1.30

**Definitions:**  
**Future demand** – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service for twenty-year projected demand or fully developed area conditions. Justification must be supplied if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.  
**Partial future demand** – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service for ten-year projected demand or partially developed area conditions. Justification must be supplied if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.  
**Current demand** – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service only for existing demand and conditions.  
**Minimal increase** – Project will reduce but not eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide a minimal but less than sufficient increase in existing capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.  
**No increase** – Project will have no effect on existing congestion or deficiencies and provide no increase in capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.

10) Readiness to Proceed - If SCIP/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded?

- 5 - Will be under contract by December 31, 2007 and no delinquent projects in Rounds 18 & 19
- 3 - Will be under contract by March 31, 2008 and/or one delinquent project in Rounds 18 & 19
- 0 - Will not be under contract by March 31, 2008 and/or more than one delinquent project in Rounds 18 & 19

Criterion 10 – Readiness to Proceed

The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience and status of design plans. A project is considered delinquent when it has not received a notice to proceed within the time stated on the original application and no time extension has been granted by the OPWC. An applying agency receiving approval for a project and subsequently canceling the same after the bid date on the application will receive zero (0) points under this round and the following round, ~~unless the Integrating Committee approves a variance.~~

11) Does the infrastructure have regional impact? Consider origination and destination of traffic, functional classifications, size of service area, and number of jurisdictions served, etc.

10 – Major Impact	Appeal Score
8 – Significant Impact	
6 – Moderate Impact	
4 – Minor Impact	
2 – Minimal or No Impact	

Criterion 11 - Regional Impact

The regional significance of the infrastructure that is being repaired or replaced.

Definitions:

**Major Impact** – Roads: Major Arterial: A direct connector to an Interstate Highway; Arterials are intended to provide a greater degree of mobility rather than land access. Arterials generally convey large traffic volumes for distances greater than one mile. A major arterial is a highway that is of regional importance and is intended to serve beyond the county. It may connect urban centers with one another and/or with outlying communities and employment or shopping centers. A major arterial is intended primarily to serve through traffic.

**Significant Impact** – Roads: Minor Arterial: A roadway, also serving through traffic, that is similar in function to a major arterial, but operates with lower traffic volumes, serves trips of shorter distances (but still greater than one mile), and may provide a higher degree of property access than do major arterials.

**Moderate Impact** – Roads: Major Collector: A roadway that provides for traffic movement between local roads/streets and arterials or community-wide activity centers and carries moderate traffic volumes over moderate distances (generally less than one mile). Major collectors may also provide direct access to abutting properties, such as regional shopping centers, large industrial parks, major subdivisions and community-wide recreational facilities, but typically not individual residences. Most major collectors are also county roads and are therefore through streets.

**Minor Impact** – Roads: Minor Collector: A roadway similar in functions to a major collector but which carries lower traffic volumes over shorter distances and has a higher degree of property access. Minor collectors may serve as main circulation streets within large, residential neighborhoods. Most minor collectors are also township roads and streets and may, or may not, be through streets.

**Minimal or No Impact** - Roads: Local: A roadway that is primarily intended to provide access to abutting properties. It tends to accommodate lower traffic volumes, serves short trips (generally within neighborhoods), and provides connections preferably only to collector streets rather than arterials.

12) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

- 10 Points
- 8 Points
- 6 Points
- 4 Points
- 2 Points

**Criterion 12 – Economic Health**  
The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the applying agency’s economic health. The economic health of a jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when census and other budgetary data are updated.

13) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure?

- 10 - Complete ban, facility closed

8 – 80% reduction in legal load or 4-wheeled vehicles only

7 – Moratorium on future development, *not* functioning for current demand

6 – 60% reduction in legal load

5 - Moratorium on future development, functioning for current demand

4 – 40% reduction in legal load

2 – 20% reduction in legal load

0 – Less than 20% reduction in legal load
- Appeal Score
- 

**Criterion 13 - Ban**  
The applying agency shall provide documentation to show that a facility ban or moratorium has been formally placed. The ban or moratorium must have been caused by a structural or operational problem. Points will only be awarded if the end result of the project will cause the ban to be lifted.

14) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project?

- 10 - 16,000 or more

8 - 12,000 to 15,999

6 - 8,000 to 11,999

4 - 4,000 to 7,999

2 - 3,999 and under
- Appeal Score
- 

**Criterion 14 - Users**  
The applying agency shall provide documentation. A registered professional engineer or the applying agency’s C.E.O must certify the appropriate documentation. Documentation may include current traffic counts, households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for the roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.

15) Has the applying agency enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or dedicated tax for the pertinent infrastructure? *(Provide documentation of which fees have been enacted.)*

- 5 - Two or more of the above

3 - One of the above

0 - None of the above
- Appeal Score
- 

**Criterion 15 – Fees, Levies, Etc.**  
The applying agency shall document (in the “Additional Support Information” form) which type of fees, levies or taxes they have dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for.

DISTRICT 2  
INTEGRATING  
COMMITTEE

ROUND 21  
HANDBOOK

RULES &  
REGULATIONS  
PROGRAM YEAR  
2007

VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT:

<http://www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/SCIP/ltip.htm>

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>FUNDING SOURCE INFORMATION</b>	<b>3</b>
GENERAL FUNDING INFORMATION	3
STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS (SCIP)	3
<i>Grants - SCIP Grants are intended for repair/replacement of existing infrastructure.</i>	3
<i>Loans / Loan Assistance</i>	3
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS (LTIP)	4
REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM FUNDS (RLP)	4
SMALL GOVERNMENT FUNDS	4
GENERAL	5
SPECIFIC	6
SUBMISSION CHECKLIST	6
<i>OPWC Application for Financial Assistance</i>	6
<i>Additional Support Information</i>	6
<i>Detailed Cost Estimate</i>	6
<i>Useful Life Statement</i>	6
<i>Status of Funds Certification</i>	7
<i>Authorizing Legislation</i>	7
<i>Capital Improvement Report</i>	7
<i>Project Pictures</i>	7
<i>Project Vicinity Map</i>	7
<i>Pre-Application Policy and Procedure</i>	7
<b>RULES FOR APPEALS &amp; AWARDS</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>ROSTERS</b>	<b>9</b>
DISTRICT TWO INTEGRATING COMMITTEE:	9
DISTRICT TWO SUPPORT STAFF:	9
OPWC PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVE:	9
<b>SUBDIVISION CODES</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>ADDENDUM</b>	<b>11</b>

## ► FUNDING SOURCE INFORMATION

### GENERAL FUNDING INFORMATION

- Types of infrastructure projects which can be funded:
  - Roadway - If applying for a group of roads, such as a subdivision, all roads must be contiguous or immediately adjacent. If the streets are not contiguous or immediately adjacent, the project will not be rated by the Support Staff or considered for funding by the Integrating Committee.
  - Bridge
  - Storm Water & Sanitary Water Collection Facilities
  - Storm Water & Sanitary Water Storage Facilities
  - Storm Water & Sanitary Treatment Facilities
  - Water Supply Systems
  - Solid Waste Disposal Facilities
- Costs for engineering, architectural, property acquisition, construction inspection, and construction management **are not** eligible for funding in District 2.
- Appurtenances, or “stand-alone” items are not eligible for funding. Examples include (but are not limited to): Curbs, traffic signals, fire hydrants, guardrail, portions of a facility such as potable water or wastewater treatment plants, etc. These items are eligible for funding only if they are part of a larger project that encompasses an entire roadway, bridge, treatment facility, etc.
- Expenditures for landscaping activities and improvements that go beyond basic requirements for infrastructure repair and post-construction repairing, stabilizing, and reseeding of land surfaces **are not** eligible for funding. Examples include (but are not limited to) sodding, trees, ornamental plants or structures, landscaped islands, signs, decorative items, etc.
- Only construction and contingency costs (“total” construction costs) are eligible for OPWC funding in District 2.
- Funds for approved projects become available on July 1 following that round application process.

### ◆ STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS (SCIP)

#### Grants - SCIP Grants are intended for repair/replacement of existing infrastructure.

- Funds can be used for rehabilitation, repair, and reconstruction - No expansion (unless expansion component is to be funded by local jurisdiction).
- Grant awards cannot be greater than 80% of the annual district allocation.
- Grants are for a maximum of 90% of the “total” construction cost of a project.
- Local jurisdiction must contribute a minimum of 10% of the “total” construction cost.

#### Loans / Loan Assistance

- Loan Assistance is a program offering grants for interest payments on OPWC eligible construction projects. These grants will pay for accrued interest on the construction period plus one year thereafter and do not have to be repaid to the Ohio Public Works Commission.
- Loan/Loan Assistance awards cannot be less than 20% of the annual district allocation.
- Any project primarily involving repair, reconstruction, or construction of facilities which are part of a system collecting fees from its users, (such as water and sewer systems) may only receive a loan or loan assistance.
- Loans may be paid off early if so desired without penalty.
- No minimum local share is required. 100% of total construction cost is fundable, unless the project involves expansion. Only 50% of expansion components are eligible for a loan. The remaining costs must be paid for by local share, SCIP grants, or outside funding.
- OPWC loans do not count against the local jurisdiction’s State of Ohio mandated 10-mil debt limitation. There is no minimum amount to borrow.
- OPWC loans do not affect a jurisdiction’s credit rating.
- The Economic Health rating of the jurisdiction determines the interest rate. All jurisdictions applying for loans and receiving 6, 8, or 10 point rating on Economic Health will receive zero (0%) percent loans. All jurisdictions receiving a 2 or 4 point rating will be offered loans on the following basis: 1-5 year term – 0%; 6-15 year term – 1 ½%; 16-20 year term – 3%

- The applicant may choose the term for repayment - between 1 and 20 years.
- Loan repayment term cannot exceed the infrastructure's useful life.
- Jurisdictions may apply for grant/loan combinations.

## ◆ **LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS (LTIP)**

- Funds can be used for rehabilitation, repair, construction, reconstruction and expansion projects. Grants only - No loans are made from LTIP funds.
- Grants are for a maximum of 90% of the "total" construction cost.
- LTIP funds may be used only for roads and bridges. Projects whose majority (50% or greater) costs are drainage items are not eligible for LTIP funding.
- Local jurisdiction must contribute a minimum of 10% of the "total" construction cost.

## ◆ **REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM FUNDS (RLP)**

- Loans may be paid off early if so desired without penalty.
- No minimum amount to borrow.
- No minimum local share is required (100% of total construction cost is fundable).
- OPWC loans do not count against the local jurisdiction's State of Ohio mandated 10-mil debt limitation.
- OPWC loans do not affect a jurisdiction's credit rating.  
The Economic Health rating of the jurisdiction determines the interest rate. All jurisdictions applying for loans and receiving 6, 8, or 10 point rating on Economic Health will receive zero (0%) percent loans. All jurisdictions receiving a 2 or 4 point rating will be offered loans on the following basis: 1-5 year term – 0%; 6-15 year term – 1 ½%; 16-20 year term – 3%
- The applicant may choose the term for repayment - between 1 and 20 years.
- Loan repayment term cannot exceed the infrastructure's useful life.

## ◆ **SMALL GOVERNMENT FUNDS**

- Grants, loans and loan assistance funds are awarded by the OPWC's Small Government Commission (the decision on fundable projects is not made on the local level) using the Small Government Commission rating system.
- Funds are awarded to local jurisdictions that have a population base of less than 5,000 residents.
- All projects must be given local consideration to determine if the project first can be funded with District SCIP/LTIP funds.
- Eligible projects not funded with District Two SCIP/LTIP funds are then rated on the Small Government's Rating system. The ten most highly rated applications are filed with the Small Government Commission. The Small Government Commission votes on these projects, each year in May.



# ► RULES FOR APPLICATION

Legend: • Rules

\* Helpful Hint

## GENERAL

**THE APPLICATION DEADLINE IS 4:00 P.M. ON THE THIRD FRIDAY OF SEPTEMBER OF EACH YEAR.** When applications are filed with the County Engineer's Office, they will be time stamped to provide proof of their receipt. Projects filed after the deadline will not be accepted. No exceptions shall be granted for any reason. Projects are to be filed at the Hamilton County Engineer's Office, 10480 Burlington Road, Cincinnati, Ohio 45231 or at the downtown location, 138 E. Court Street, County Administration Building, Room 700, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. The applicant is solely responsible for filing the application. The applicant is also solely responsible for the content of the application(s) filed. Applications will not be accepted by email or fax.

- Fill all documents out completely and sign where applicable.
- **Study the rating system form and its' addendum to fully understand how projects are awarded points, then fill out your application accordingly. Remember - detail counts!**
- Documents needed to be filed in order for an application to be considered a complete and eligible for funding are:
  - Submission Checklist
  - OPWC Application for Financial Assistance
  - District Two Additional Support Information
  - Detailed Cost Estimate
  - Useful Life Statement
  - Status of Funds Certification
  - Enabling Legislation
  - Capital Improvement Report
  - Project Pictures
    - \* Obtain photographs that will accurately reflect the condition of the facility cited in the application. An example would be to take a picture of a roadway or drainage project during or immediately after a rain event.
  - Project Vicinity Map
    - \* The more detail provided will assist the rating team to identify unique circumstances about the facility being applied for. If needed, have a broad location map, and a more detailed large-scale map to identify the project and any surrounding features that will support your application.
- Documents needed to be filed in order for an application to be considered for maximum points are:
  - Infrastructure Condition Data
  - Infrastructure Safety Data
  - Infrastructure Health Data
  - Jurisdiction User Fee / Assessment Data
  - Economic Growth Data
  - Alleviate Traffic Hazard / LOS Data
  - Relevant Traffic Accident Reports/Summaries and accident rates
  - Ban / Moratorium Data – a copy of legislation passed by the jurisdiction is required.
  - Certified Traffic Count – must be signed by either a registered professional engineer or the CEO of the jurisdiction on official jurisdiction letterhead.
- \* **The local jurisdiction should provide as much information as possible to assist the district committee in understanding the limits, needs, costs and reasons for the application for funding. The local committee has determined that, if an application does not offer a certain piece of information, it considers the lowest possible value for that information.**
- A facility may be applied for only once in a given round. For instance, a roadway may be applied for either in a separate application, or with a group of streets, but not both.
- Once submitted, an application may not be changed from a grant request to a loan request for any purpose.
- After an application is submitted, the application information can only be changed under the rules herein specified:

- 1.) The Support Staff will review an application for completeness only if it is received no later than one week before the deadline for receiving applications.
  - a.) The Support Staff will contact the affected jurisdiction and allow three business days for missing item(s) to be submitted.
  - b.) Items submitted after the three-day notification period will not be considered as part of the original application.
- 2.) If the rating team reports that the application has important items missing (ex: signed and sealed construction estimate, full description of scope of work for the project, no additional support information, etc.), that application shall be considered incomplete and not rated by the Support Staff.
  - a.) The application and letter explaining the decision shall be sent to the affected jurisdiction.
  - b.) This cannot be appealed unless the applicant can demonstrate that the information was included in the original application.

## **SPECIFIC**

### ***Submission Checklist***

- Use the Submission Checklist to assure completeness and to assure your maximum points.

### **OPWC Application for Financial Assistance**

#### **Section 1 - Project Financial Information**

- Minimum local share is 10% for grants.
- Loans require no local share, but will receive a higher point value if a match is offered (See Rating System).
- \* **Remember – a greater match means higher scores.**
- Costs for engineering, inspection, and land acquisition are not eligible in District 2.

#### **Section 2 - Project Information**

- \* **Be descriptive - Details assist the district staff in evaluating your project properly. There is no such thing as an over-documented application.**

#### **Section 4 Project Schedule**

- True and realistic dates are required, and past history for each jurisdiction meeting project deadlines will be taken into consideration.
- \* **Remember, preference will be given to any project that will be under contract during the construction season in which the funds are received. Failure to meet the project schedule may result in OPWC termination of the project and/or point reductions in future funding rounds.**

#### **Section 7 - Applicant Certification**

- Must be signed and dated by Chief Executive Officer.

### **Additional Support Information**

- To acquire the maximum points possible for your application fill this form out in detail.
- \* **Be descriptive and detailed. The district support staff relies on this form heavily when scoring projects. Study the rating system form and its' addendum to fully understand how projects are awarded points, then fill out your application so that you can receive the greatest advantage. Time should be taken to be sure this form gives the requested information. Attach additional sheets if necessary.**

### **Detailed Cost Estimate**

- Show an "itemized" cost estimate that accurately reflects the project cost. All items noted as a component of the project must be included in the estimate.
- Signed and sealed by Professional Engineer registered in the State of Ohio.

### **Useful Life Statement**

- Minimum useful life is seven years for any project.
- The average of all projects funded by the district cannot be less than 20 years.
- Signed and sealed by Professional Engineer registered in the State of Ohio.

## **Status of Funds Certification**

- Must certify local share funds are or will be available.
- Must be on jurisdiction's official letterhead.
- Must be signed by Chief Fiscal Officer.
- Must be included for each funding source listed in the application. For projects using Municipal Road Funds (MRF) for matching funds, a copy of the current MRF application filed with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office shall meet the requirement.

## **Authorizing Legislation**

- Must be on jurisdiction's official letterhead.
- Legislation authorizing the Chief Executive Officer to apply for OPWC funding and enter into contract with the OPWC.
- Establishing jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer, Chief Fiscal Officer, and Project Manager.
- Must be signed by either the jurisdictions' Chief Fiscal Officer or Clerk.
- Must be filed by the first Monday of November of each year with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office.

## **Capital Improvement Report**

- Fully detailed Capital Improvement Report (CIR) and the 5 Year Plan form *must* be submitted no later than the first Monday of November of each year using the OPWC forms. The District will file the CIR with the OPWC. You may request the forms be e-mailed to you (on Excel spreadsheet), and you may e-mail the CIR to: [joe.cottrill@hamilton-co.org](mailto:joe.cottrill@hamilton-co.org)
- No grants, credit enhancements, or loans will be awarded by the OPWC until the successful jurisdiction has submitted an acceptable Capital Improvement Report and Five-Year Plan.

## **Project Pictures**

- Minimum of four - mounted on 8 1/2" x 11" paper.

## **Project Vicinity Map**

- Must be legible with project limits highlighted.

## **PRE-APPLICATION POLICY AND PROCEDURE:**

The purpose of the pre-application is to allow a governmental jurisdiction to have a roadway or bridge pre-rated for condition so as to be able to perform maintenance on the infrastructure and not severely affect the condition score when applying for SCIP/LTIP funds. Only roads and bridges are permitted to apply for a pre-rating score. This year, applications for pre-rating roads and bridges will be for Round 21 funds.

The Support Staff will pre-rate the infrastructure for condition only, and keep the score in confidence. The pre-rating score is not appealable and will not be available until all preliminary scores for the applying round are released. The pre-rating score will count for 75% toward the score and the current condition will count 25% toward the score.

Applications for pre-rating a road or bridge will be accepted according to the following schedule:

Round 21 Projects: Through 4:00 PM, Friday, August 25, 2006

Pre-applicants must provide the date the maintenance activity will begin so the Support Staff can view it before the work is started. Applications for pre-rating will be accepted for a project that will be applied for in the following year's round. The pre-rating score will be valid for one round only. Failure to meet the terms of the Pre-Application document will result in disqualification for consideration in the following round.

## ► RULES FOR APPEALS & AWARDS

- Any single or multiple criteria of the point rating system may be appealed, except criterion 4, 7, 8 and 12.
- Appeal review will be based only on information provided in the original application. No new information provided after the original submission date will be considered.
- If a jurisdiction appeals its' project rating, the support staff may, upon review of the appeal, **increase or decrease** the points of the appealed category.
- A second rating team will review the appeal, rather than the original rating team.
- The following decisions rest exclusively with the District Integrating Committee:
  - Points awarded to a project application
  - Number and dollar amounts of projects funded
  - Funding source and funding type for all projects
  - Loan rates
  - Criteria used for project selection
- A decision (seven out of nine affirmative votes is required) of the District Integrating Committee **is final** and therefore cannot be appealed.

## ► ROSTERS

### DISTRICT TWO INTEGRATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Member	Representing	Phone
William W. Brayshaw - Chairman	Hamilton County	946-8902
Richard D. Huddleston	Hamilton County - At Large	771-0900
Scott C. Stiles	City of Cincinnati	352-5373 583-9292
Eileen Enabnit	City of Cincinnati	352-6232
Steven G. Bailey	City of Cincinnati	352-6275 5484
David J. Savage	Hamilton County Municipal League	821-7600
Daniel R. Brooks	Hamilton County Municipal League	521-7413
Thomas Bryan	Hamilton County Township Association	522-8532
Joseph I. Sykes	Hamilton County Township Association	941-2466

### DISTRICT TWO ALTERNATE MEMBERS:

Alternate Member	Alternate for:	Phone
Ted Hubbard	William W. Brayshaw	946-8903
Ron Roberts	Richard D. Huddleston	946-4403
Chad Munitz	Scott C. Stiles	352-5368
Don Rosemeyer	Eileen Enabnit	352-3720
Deborah Holston	Steven G. Bailey	352-5359
Stephanie Stoller	David J. Savage	745-8510
Robert Bemmes	Daniel R. Brooks	733-3725
Robert Bass	Thomas Bryan	922-8609
Rob Molloy	Joseph I. Sykes	791-8447

### DISTRICT TWO SUPPORT STAFF MEMBERS:

Member	Jurisdiction	Phone
Joseph Cottrill - District Liaison	Hamilton County Engineer's	946-8906
Richard Cline - Tech. Assistance Facilitator	City of Cincinnati	352-6235
Robert Bass - Tech. Assistance Facilitator	Delhi Township	922-8609
William Shefcik	City of Cincinnati	352-5273
Bryan Williams	City of Cincinnati	352-4506
Greg Long	City of Cincinnati	352-5289
Douglas Riddiough	Hamilton County Engineer's	946-4277
Eric Beck	Hamilton County Engineer's	946-8432
John Beck	Hamilton County Engineer's	946-4267
Rob Molloy	Sycamore Township	791-8447
John Knuf	City of North College Hill	521-7413

### OPWC PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVE:

District Two Representative	Address	Phone
Michael Miller	65 East State Street - Suite 312 Columbus, Ohio 43215	(614) 752-9343

## ► SUBDIVISION CODES

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Township</b>	<b>Number</b>
Addyston	061 - 00436	Anderson	061 - 01980
Amberley Village	061 - 01672	Colerain	061 - 16616
Arlington Heights	061 - 02428	Columbia	061 - 16882
Blue Ash	061 - 07300	Crosby	061 - 19470
Cheviot	061 - 14128	Delhi	061 - 21504
Cincinnati	061 - 15000	Green	061 - 31752
Cleves	061 - 16028	Harrison	061 - 33852
Deer Park	061 - 21266	Miami	061 - 49364
Elmwood Place	061 - 25186	Springfield	061 - 74121
Evendale	061 - 25802	Sycamore	061 - 75973
Fairfax	061 - 25942	Symmes	061 - 76028
Forest Park	061 - 27706	Whitewater	061 - 84938
Glendale	061 - 30380		
Golf Manor	061 - 30786		
Greenhills	061 - 32158		
Harrison	061 - 33838	<b>County</b>	<b>Number</b>
Indian Hill	061 - 76582	Hamilton	061 - 00061
Lincoln Heights	061 - 43722		
Lockland	061 - 44366		
Loveland	061 - 45108		
Madeira	061 - 46312		
Mariemont	061 - 47600		
Montgomery	061 - 51716		
Mount Healthy	061 - 52752		
Newtown	061 - 55678		
North College Hill	061 - 56322		
North Bend	061 - 56182		
Norwood	061 - 57386		
Reading	061 - 65732		
Sharonville	061 - 71892		
Silverton	061 - 72522		
Springdale	061 - 74104		
St. Bernard	061 - 69470		
Terrace Park	061 - 76428		
Woodlawn	061 - 86366		
Wyoming	061 - 86730		



# DISTRICT 2 SCIP/LTIP FUNDS PY 2007 SCHEDULE ROUND 21

***EARLY FILING DEADLINE  
APPLICATION DEADLINE***

By 4:00 p.m., Friday, September 8, 2006\*  
By 4:00 p.m., Friday, September 15, 2006  
(Applications filed later will not be accepted)

***PROJECT REVIEW & RATING  
PRELIMINARY SCORES TO COMMITTEE  
JURISDICTION APPEAL PERIOD  
APPEAL REVIEW & RATING  
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT REPORT DUE  
LEGISLATION DUE  
PROJECT ESTABLISHMENT VOTE  
PROJECT FILING WITH OPWC  
PROJECT AGREEMENTS MAILED***

September 19, 2006 thru October 20, 2006  
October 27, 2006  
October 25, 2006 thru 4:00 p.m. November 3, 2006  
November 6, 2006 thru November 13, 2006  
November 1, 2006  
November 1, 2006  
Integrating Committee Meeting, December 8, 2006  
ASAP after December 8, 2006  
July 1, 2007

\*Project applications filed by the Early Filing Date will be checked by the Support Staff for completeness.

All applications are to be filed at:

Hamilton County Engineer's Office  
10480 Burlington Road  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45231

Or

Hamilton County Engineer's Office  
138 East Court Street  
County Administration Building, Room 700  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Call 513-946-8906 with any questions.

Please visit our website for complete information. Everything necessary for applying is available online at:

<http://www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/SCIP/ltip.htm>